### BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA



Order Instituting Rulemaking to Implement the Commission's Procurement Incentive Framework and to Examine the Integration of Greenhouse Gas Emissions Standards into Procurement Policies.

Rulemaking 06-04-009

### OPENING COMMENTS OF PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY (U 39 E) ON TYPE AND POINT OF REGULATION ISSUES UNDER AB 32

CHRISTOPHER J. WARNER

Pacific Gas and Electric Company

77 Beale Street

San Francisco, CA 94105

Telephone: (415) 973-6695 Facsimile: (415) 972-5220

E-Mail: CJW5@pge.com

Attorneys for

Dated: December 3, 2007 PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF PG&E'S OPENING COMMENTS ON TYPE AND POINT OF REGULATION FOR GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS UNDER AB 32	1
III.	RESPONSES TO SPECIFIC QUESTIONS	2
IV.	CONCLUSION	45

### BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Implement the Commission's Procurement Incentive Framework and to Examine the Integration of Greenhouse Gas Emissions Standards into Procurement Policies.

Rulemaking 06-04-009

### OPENING COMMENTS OF PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY (U 39 E) ON TYPE AND POINT OF REGULATION ISSUES UNDER AB 32

#### I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to the ruling of the Administrative Law Judges dated November 9, 2007 (ALJs' Ruling), Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) provides its opening comments on issues relating to the type and point of regulation under AB 32. PG&E's comments are provided in responses to the specific questions contained in the ALJs' Ruling.

## II. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF PG&E'S OPENING COMMENTS ON TYPE AND POINT OF REGULATION FOR GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS UNDER AB 32

In more detailed comments below, PG&E addresses the alternatives or variations on the First Seller and Load-Based Cap approaches identified in this ALJs Ruling, PG&E believes that the key variable to consider in assessing these alternatives is whether a national GHG system is likely to be implemented within the same general time frame as AB 32. PG&E believes the answer is yes, a national GHG system is likely to be in place in the same general time frame as implementation of AB 32, and therefore two of the alternatives listed in this ALJs Ruling (in-state only source-based, and programmatic implementation of AB 32 pending adoption of a national program) could

be evaluated further for implementing AB 32 prior to the effective date of the national program. Although PG&E does not necessarily endorse either of these two alternatives to a source-based or first seller approaches, which PG&E prefers, we do believe that either of the two alternatives may be significantly more efficient and effective than any load-based approach or other similar alternative listed in the ALJs Ruling.

### III. RESPONSES TO SPECIFIC QUESTIONS

#### 3.1. General

Q1. What do you view as the incremental benefits of a market-based system for GHG compliance, in the current California context?

PG&E Response: The benefits of implementing a well designed market-based compliance program in California now include: (1) cost effectiveness—the compliance flexibility afforded by the cap-and-trade approach will direct capital investment to the lowest cost control opportunities; (2) environmental integrity—the cap-and-trade approach sets a specific reduction target, providing a high degree of certainty that the AB 32 reduction goals will be met; and (3) momentum for federal action—momentum is building to pass federal cap-and-trade legislation and state actions will help to build this momentum, while providing learning opportunities for California companies.

Q2. Can a market-based system provide additional emissions reductions beyond existing policies and/or programs? If so, at what level? How much of such additional emission reductions could be achieved through expansion of existing policies and/or programs?

**PG&E Response:** A well-designed market-based system can achieve additional reductions beyond existing policies by establishing a market price for carbon, bringing in additional investment and thus encouraging a broader array of GHG emissions reduction strategies. Many experts conclude that market-based incentives and resulting investments will further advance GHG emissions abatement technology research and

development and accelerate the introduction of leading edge carbon reduction technologies. Existing policies and programs are generally targeted at specific strategies, such as energy efficiency and renewable energy, rather than encouraging all cost-effective abatement opportunities, and thus are likely to achieve fewer emissions reductions. The market based system is more likely to stimulate broader sector participation, including the transportation sector, encourage a broader set of actions within each sector, and facilitate cost-effective use of offsets. Market price signals established at the national and international levels provide the broadest impetus for lowand zero-carbon technologies.

- 3.2. Principles or Objectives to be Considered in Evaluating Design Options Public Utilities Commission Staff proposes that the following principles or objectives be used to evaluate GHG program design options and to develop recommendations regarding a GHG regulatory approach. The objectives are not presented in any particular order.
- Goal attainment: Does the approach being considered have any particular advantages in terms of meeting overall emission reduction goals? For example, does the approach have any advantages to promoting energy efficiency, combined heat and power, or renewable energy?
- Cost minimization: Is the approach likely to minimize the total cost to end users of achieving a given GHG reduction target?
- Compatibility with wholesale markets and the Market Redesign and Technology Upgrade: What are the implications of the approach on efficient functioning of wholesale markets generally and the California Independent System Operator day-ahead and real-time markets?
- Legal risk: Is the approach at greater relative risk of being delayed or overturned in court?
- Environmental Integrity: Does the approach mitigate or allow contract shuffling and the leakage of emissions occurring outside of California as a result of efforts to reduce emissions in California?
- **Expandability**: Would the approach integrate easily into a broader regional or national program? A related consideration is the suitability of the approach as a model for a

national or regional program.

- **Accuracy**: Does the approach support accuracy in reporting and, therefore, ensure that reported emission reductions are real?
- Administrative Simplicity: Does the approach promote greater simplicity for reporting entities, verifiers, and state agency staff? How easy will the program design be to administer?
- Q3. Do you agree with this set of objectives? Are there other objectives or principles that you wish to see included? If so, please include your recommendations and reasoning. Finally, please rank the objectives above, and any additional factors you propose, in order of importance.

PG&E Response: PG&E generally agrees with the objectives listed above, with one important addition. PG&E recommends that "Technological innovation" be added as a key objective. As the State of California stated in its "Recommendations for Federal Climate Policy" provided to members of Congress and the Executive Branch, "New technologies are critical to successfully combating and coping with climate change and the use of technology-neutral performance standards and market mechanisms will give the private sector incentives to innovate while adding the flexibility to develop new markets for low-carbon energy supplies and products." Thus, a high priority of AB 32's regulatory design should be its ability to incent and support technological innovations that can cost effectively speed the transition to a low-carbon economy throughout California.

In terms of priorities for these various objectives, as stated in its prior comments, PG&E recommends that three over-arching objectives should govern AB 32 implementation policies: "Goal attainment," "Cost minimization, and "Expandability." AB 32 should be designed to achieve long term sustained GHG

<sup>1/</sup> Broad use of offsets will also provide added impetus for global technology transfer.

emissions reductions in order to speed the transition to a low carbon economy, should mitigate the costs incurred by California consumers and businesses to achieve those reductions, and should be easily expandable and scalable into a regional, national or international program. Achieving these objectives in a balanced, fair and administratively efficient manner should be the over-arching goal of AB 32 implementation, with all other objectives serving to support these overall objectives.

### 3.3. Load-Based Cap-and-Trade System Design

Under a load-based approach, the regulated entities would be the retail providers of electricity to California consumers. Retail providers would be required to surrender allowances for the GHG emissions associated with all power sold to end users in California. Generators would not have a compliance obligation under this system, except possibly for exported power, as discussed in more detail below.

Q4. With a load-based cap-and-trade system, should exports from in-state generation sources be included and accounted for under the cap? Why or why not? If so, how? For example, exports could be captured in a cap-and-trade system by regulating in-state sources that export, or by counting the emissions associated with exported power, without any compliance obligation on the exporter. There may be other options as well.

**PG&E Response:** A national source based system would avoid this problem. Under a Load Based Cap, exports from in-state generation sources would not be accounted for under the cap. However, under first seller and in-state source based approaches, all exports from in-state generation would be included in the cap because they would be regulated at the source.

Q5. How extensive do you view the threat of contract shuffling under a load-based program, given the accessibility of clean resources within the western interconnect? What mechanisms do you propose to combat this possibility? On what basis do you support your position? Under a load-based system, three basic options may be used to match a retail provider's load to the sources of electricity used to serve the load: (1) the use of contracts and settlements data, (2) the development of a tracking system to facilitate matching sources to loads, with unclaimed sources pooled and assigned to all retail providers for any electricity that cannot be accounted for on a specified basis, and (3) the use of a tracking system and tradable emission attribute certificates (TEAC) to ensure that all electricity is assigned.

PG&E Response: There is no way to entirely combat contract shuffling if a single state like California is the only state with restrictions on carbon emissions in an interconnected regional power market like the WECC. Only a national, or at least WECC-wide, source-based system would prevent contract shuffling. PG&E agrees with Dallas Burtraw of Resources for the Future and a member of the Governor's Market Advisory Committee, who has stated:

"Further, efforts to prevent increased imports from unregulated regions (GHG "leakage") or to incent emissions reductions elsewhere in the west by identifying sources of power for imports and their emissions are likely to be ineffective, regardless of the administrative procedures used to identify specific generation sources. Consequently, any policy—load-based or source-based—that addresses only California emissions, or attempts to prevent leakage by administrative procedures that identify sources of imports, is very likely to have its environmental goals frustrated by the inability of a California-only policy to alter operations or investment decisions elsewhere in the western North American market."<sup>2/</sup>

In a California-only context, to reduce contract shuffling, importers must have ownership relationships or unit specific contracts with out of state resources in order to be regulated based on claimed specified imports.

Under a national or regional regime, load based caps become almost impossibly complex. All of the states involved will have to agree on the methodologies to determine the emissions value of power imported and exported. Entities in other states might try to claim that specific coal generation in their states is exported to California, even if California LSEs do not have unit specific relationships and do not choose to import coal-based power. California IOUs are uniquely vulnerable to this concern because (1) they may purchase electricity through bid-based, carbon-blind integrated

<sup>&</sup>lt;u>2</u>/ Dallas Burtraw, Resources for the Future, Discussion Paper 07-49; November, 2007 <a href="http://www.rff.org/rff/Documents/RFF-DP-07-49.pdf">http://www.rff.org/rff/Documents/RFF-DP-07-49.pdf</a>, pp.3- 4.

forward markets operated by the California Independent System Operator and (2) they cannot prevent unit-specific bids into those "pools" from out-of-state coal generators.

The three options cited in the question to mitigate contract shuffling would be unlikely to be effective, because none of the options addresses the fact that Western power markets rely to a large extent on imports and exports of unspecified energy that are untraceable from the load to a specific unit or source. Thus, the most viable long-term method for avoiding contract shuffling would be a national or WECC-wide source based cap.

Q6. Which of these systems best accounts for all imports? What are the advantages and disadvantages of each potential tracking system in terms of accuracy, cost of development and administration of tracking systems, costs of administration to the parties, and overall costs to ratepayers? Are there alternative tracking approaches that you would recommend, and for what reasons?

**PG&E Response:** None of these tracking systems can precisely account for emissions associated with imports. For individual transactions, load serving entities may or may not be the entities who import the power into California. Marketers can and do bring power from out-of-state sources into CAISO markets, where it is pooled and purchased by LSEs. When system power, or unspecified energy, is purchased in California, the LSE purchasing the power will not know if the power is imported or from what specific source or sources the power originates.

An effective power pool will result in an efficient mix of resources for the market as a whole; it is not intended to link individual generators to individual loads.

Any attempts to assign or track generation based on loads, whether generated in state or imported, will necessarily depend on a policy outcome, such as using default emissions rates or disaggregate emissions attributes. A technical or database solution to match

generation that runs through a power pool to particular load does not exist. PG&E is not optimistic that a feasible, accurate system that can track electricity flow through a multitude of transactions and repackaging can be developed in the near future without a host of simplifying assumptions, thereby creating an inherently inaccurate tracking and reporting system for emissions.

Of the three options listed, options (1) and (2) are not distinct. Option 1 appears to be a partial source of data for setting up a tracking system. When viewed together, it remains true that many imports and in-state generation will be blended into a pool and assigned to LSEs. LSEs will be forced either to accept this system average based on some approximating method, or electricity dispatch will become more inefficient as LSEs use more unit-specific contracts in lieu of economic unspecified energy, resulting in a thin day-ahead spot market. In the former case, customers may have to pay for more emissions than actually exist. In the latter case, scheduling problems and uneconomic dispatch may also increase costs and, possibly, emissions. Either way, California will have to conduct a potentially highly arbitrary and contentious analysis in order to determine which specific generation can be claimed by LSEs and which goes into the general pool for allocation, with approximations of emissions rates. Because this process will be complicated and contentious, it also is likely to impose additional administrative and transaction costs on utility customers.

While option (3), using TEACs, has advantages over the other load based cap options, it has large administrative complexities and costs that outweigh potential

<sup>3/</sup> For further explanation, please refer to the report issues by the Market Surveillance Committee of the California Independent System Operator, entitled "Opinion on "Load-based and Source-based Tracking of Carbon Dioxide in California," November 27, 2007, (http://www.caiso.com/1c9d/1c9d6f661ba60.pdf).

advantages and may not be viable in the long-term. The TEACs system could internalize the value of low GHG emitting generation in the dispatch decision by decreasing the marginal cost to customers of lower emitting resources more than it decreases the marginal cost of higher emitting resources. Unlike the other options, it is possible to provide an emissions-related price signal in short-term markets with this option.

This approach, however, has some significant drawbacks. Implementing TEACs for just one or a few states in WECC will create a need to arbitrarily decide which generators are to be included in the TEAC system. If all generators in the WECC are included, but not all LSEs, surplus TEACs will render the system ineffective—high-GHG TEACs will go unassigned and the resulting price may be very low.

TEACs may address the problem of unspecified energy delivered from a power pool, giving utilities control over their emissions profile. However, implementing the systems and markets needed to make TEACs viable would require substantial up front costs to create the infrastructure for the trading platform. Even if this obstacle were surmounted, entities would have to trade in three different markets: the energy market, the TEACs market, and the allowances market. As pointed out by Olivia Hartridge of Morgan Stanley, creating such a complicated system of related but separate markets might discourage active participation by a variety of entities. Additionally, the layers of multiple markets increase the opportunities for arbitrage and market manipulation. Finally, because a national system is likely to be source-based, California would have to invest a large amount of money and effort to create a system that would quickly become

Olivia Hartridge, Morgan Stanley, comments during presentation at PUC/ CEC Joint Workshop, April 19, 2007.

obsolete and incompatible with other emissions markets and systems once these broader trading systems began operating.

Thus, option (1) may simply provide a source of data for Option 2. Option (2) will be inaccurate and will impose significant administrative costs for a short-lived system. Option (3), relying on TEACs, may more accurate than the others, but is very complicated, requires large start up costs, and is likely to be unnecessary and incompatible with a national or international source-based system once implemented.

## Q7. If a load-based approach is pursued, would the potential benefits of a full TEAC system be great enough to warrant the start-up and administrative costs?

**PG&E Response:** No. As explained above, while the TEAC system is the only option of the three presented that attempts to incorporate environmental, least cost dispatch under a load based cap system and to resolve the attribution of generation dispatched into a power pool, the enormous complexity of having three markets, an administrative determination of which WECC generators can participate and which cannot, the administrative and start up costs, and the cost of dismantling the system make this option inferior to source-based and first seller systems.

### 3.4. Source-based Cap-and-trade System Design Options

### 3.4.1. Pure Source-based (GHG Regulation of In-state Generation Only)

Under an in-state-only source-based approach, the regulated entities would be the power plants located in California that generate electricity and emit GHGs. Under such a system, electricity use associated with imports would not be directly regulated under the cap-and-trade system. Instead, other policies and programs such as energy efficiency and the Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) would be utilized to decrease reliance on imported GHG-intensive power sources.

Q8. Do you view this approach as compliant with Assembly Bill (AB) 32? Please support your answer.

**PG&E Response:** Yes. AB 32 provides the ARB with discretion regarding the design of

particular emissions reduction measures, strategies and programs needed to meet the overall AB 32 statewide emissions limit.

The threat of leakage can be viewed over two time horizons: short-term and long-term.

Q9. In light of the relatively high capacity factors of carbon-intensive facilities outside the state, how extensive do you expect the short-term threat of substituting higher-carbon imports for in-state generation to be? Might this possibility be dealt with through specific program design (e.g., allocations, limiting conditions, etc.)?

**PG&E Response:** Under a "pure" source based cap (i.e. emissions limits are applied only to sources, not to other entities) for California in-state generation only, it is probable that imports from lower cost sources will increase. Whether these imports are more GHG intensive that the in-state power being displaced is unclear, because coal dispatch is likely to remain unchanged in the short-term.

In-state electricity prices will rise as in-state generators internalize emissions in their running costs and bids. Imports may increase as out-of-state entities take advantage of the higher price and will not incur a corresponding compliance cost. Whether this will greatly increase the emissions associated with electricity serving California is unclear. In most hours, and in most areas of the WECC, the marginal, price-setting generators are gas-fired combined cycle plants (gas CCs). A cap-and-trade program solely applicable to in-state generators may lead mainly to reduced generation by in-state gas CCs, and increased generation by out-of-state gas CCs that do not incur a compliance cost, and increased imports as well. Overall emissions from WECC generators may increase somewhat due to increased generation overall, to overcome increased transmission losses. However, the cap-and-trade program would probably not affect the dispatch of out-of-state coal plants; these facilities have such low running

costs, compared to gas CCs, that they will run at high capacity factors regardless of programs California imposes.

In the medium-term, if other Western states implement cap-and-trade programs that exempt exports while California continues to regulate only in-state generation, out-of-state entities may claim that coal based generation is being exported to California even though coal-based dispatch is unchanged. In the long-term, a California only source-based cap could lead to reduced investment in plants inside the state in favor of new facilities elsewhere.

However, despite these limitations, an in-state only source-based cap may have merit, giving California valuable insight into the cap and trade market with the greatest administrative simplicity. Further, assuming an in-state only source-based cap is superseded over the short or mid-term by a national source-based system, the incentive for long-term contracts with high-emitting imports is likely to be significantly reduced. In addition, the current prohibition on California utilities signing long-term contracts with high emitting resources provides additional assurances that this will not occur. Thus, PG&E believes the "short term threat" of higher-emitting imports may not be significant in terms of emissions, as the marginal resource being imported is likely to be similar to the marginal resource in California and may not outweigh the advantages of an administratively simple in-state, source-based system.

Q10. Given existing procurement oversight and the prospect for a regional or federal GHG program in the foreseeable future, how extensive do you expect the threat to be of a longer-term shift of production to regions beyond the reach of a California source-based cap-and-trade regime?

**PG&E Response:** If a federal or regional GHG program is perceived to be probable

(which PG&E believes to be the case), the threat of a long term shift of generation to regions outside California would be significantly reduced even if California has adopted an in-state only source-based cap. Again, the rules implementing SB1368 provide additional assurance. As soon as a federal or WECC-wide program is established, any shift in generation between states will be the result of internalizing carbon costs, a desirable outcome. This compatibility with a future federal source-based program is one of the key advantages of the first seller approach, as identified by a number of environmental groups, other parties and the Governor's Market Advisory Committee.

Q11. If emissions associated with imported power are excluded from a cap-and-trade program, what policies beyond the existing suite of program including energy efficiency, California Solar Initiative, RPS, and Emission Performance Standard (EPS) do you recommend that California employ to achieve the necessary reductions from the electricity sector?

PG&E Response: PG&E believes there are a number of technological innovations that may be pursued beyond the existing suite of California energy policy programs in order to incent and obtain additional GHG reductions from the electric sector, including power imports. Among other programs, new customer metering and home energy management technologies offer promise for reducing electricity loads and therefore reducing GHGs. New customer energy efficiency technologies applicable in the commercial and industrial sectors, along with improvements in building and appliance design standards, also offer longer term opportunities for achieving significant permanent reductions in GHGs in the electric sector. Significant upgrades of bulk power transmission facilities in Western power markets, including with Canadian resources, also offer opportunities for further substitution of low carbon electricity for higher emitting sources.

Q12. As the Public Utilities Commission does not currently have authority to oversee all energy efficiency and renewable procurement programs for all kinds of

retail providers (investor owned utilities (IOUs), community choice aggregators (CCAs), electric service providers (ESPs), and publicly owned utilities (POUs)), which agency(ies) should fill in any gaps? Which agency should be responsible for overseeing energy efficiency and renewable procurement for POUs? Would the California Air Resources Board (ARB) have the authority to require certain energy efficiency and renewable targets be met by POUs?

**PG&E Response:** The CPUC should continue to oversee the IOUs for CEE and RPS programs. Where the CPUC does not have the authority to oversee similar programs offered by other LSEs, these LSEs should have the same compliance responsibilities as IOUs. PG&E does not have a view at this time as to which particular agency should have regulatory oversight over non-IOU LSEs.

Q13. What sources would a source-based system cover? Could it cover California utility-owned facilities located outside of California?

**PG&E Response:** A source-based system could cover all stationary sources of greenhouse gas emissions, similar to the source-based regulatory programs that currently cover criteria air pollutants emitted by stationary sources under the California and federal Clean Air Acts. To the extent that California utilities own generating facilities located outside California and import power from those facilities into California, a source-based system could cover such facilities on a non-discriminatory basis through regulation of such power imports by "first sellers/first deliverers."

Q14. Would a strengthened EPS assist in reducing emissions due to California imports? What recommended changes would you make to the EPS?

**PG&E Response:** In PG&E's view, a strengthened EPS should not affect dispatch and therefore emissions levels in the short-term. The prohibition of California LSEs signing contracts 5 years or longer with high emitting facilities will affect future investment in these facilities. PG&E suggests no changes currently.

#### 3.4.2. Deliverer/First Seller

The term "deliverer/first seller" generally refers to the entity that first delivers or sells electricity into the electricity grid in California. For generation within California, the deliverer/first seller (the regulated entity) would be the generator, similar to a source-based system. For imported power, the deliverer/first seller would be the entity that delivers the electricity into the California grid (the first sale within California), which could be a retail provider (an IOU, POU, ESP, or CCA) or wholesale marketer.

Q15. Please comment on the "First Seller Design Description" paper, which is Attachment A to this ruling. Does the paper accurately describe the deliverer/first seller program? If not, describe your concerns and include an accurate description from your perspective.

**PG&E Response:** While the paper in Attachment A ("Resero") does contain useful discussion, it lacks key facts and information on the design and implementation of a "first seller/first deliverer" system and thus its value is limited in evaluating the First Seller approach. (PG&E notes that Resero apparently was expected to consult with and gather information from key stakeholders on the First Seller approach, but did not contact PG&E or apparently other IOUs for such purpose.) As a threshold matter, the Resero paper is incomplete in that it identifies areas where First Seller is argued to be more complex than the Load Based Cap approach, but the paper then does not attempt to identify where the First Seller is simpler, more accurate and more easily implementable than the Load Based Cap. Finally, the Resero paper highlights areas which it calls "pitfalls" of the First Seller approach, but then fails to state that these issues exist without regard to whether the point of regulation is the First Seller or Load Based Cap and exist because California is implementing a single-state solution, rather than a national approach. In this regard, the Resero paper would benefit from including the type of analysis and evaluation of AB 32 point of regulation issues that the Market Surveillance Committee of the California Independent System Operator recently

submitted in this proceeding, which concluded that a Load Based Cap could have significant adverse impacts on the operation of wholesale regional electricity markets. <sup>5</sup>/
In summary, a point by point comparison of First Seller and a Load Based Cap would have provided a more informative discussion of the relative merits of these alternatives.

The following is a summary of PG&E's primary comments on the Resero paper, with a detailed discussion following the summary.:

- The Resero paper is factually and logically incorrect in asserting that the First Seller approach is more complex than the Load-Based Cap simply because there are fewer LSEs than First Sellers.
- The Resero paper erroneously finds that in-state generation emissions data would be managed in the same way under the First Seller and the Load-Based Cap approaches, thereby ignoring a huge complexity and defect in the Load-Based Cap.
- The Resero paper correctly states that the First Seller approach works with CAISO markets and incorporates emissions costs into energy prices but fails to point out that the Load-Based Cap does not do so.
- The Resero paper mistakenly attributes complications with California's reporting and regulation of imported and unspecified power to the First Seller approach, ignoring the fact that these problems have nothing to do with the point of regulation and in fact are increased under a Load-Based Cap.
- The Resero paper incorrectly finds that limitations on the use of e-tags hinders the use of the First Seller approach, when such e-tag limitations have nothing to do with the point of regulation at all. E-tags could be used as documentation to verify importing entities and amounts imported. E-tags will not be used to assign GHG emissions to imports. The point of regulation is irrelevant to this use of E-tags.
- The Resero paper is incorrect in concluding that use of unit specific contracts to define imports is a viable and preferred alternative to the tracking and reporting of unspecified imports by "first seller" marketers.

## The paper is incorrect in stating that First Seller is more complex than the Load-Based Cap because LSEs are a smaller, more stable group than First Sellers.

Part 1 of the Resero paper incorrectly labels the First Seller approach as "more complex"

Market Surveillance Committee, California Independent System Operator, "Opinion on 'Load-based and Source-based Tracking of Carbon Dioxide in California," November 27, 2007 (http://www.caiso.com/1c9d/1c9d6f661ba60.pdf).

than a Load-Based Cap because tracking imports requires identifying "a constantly changing set of First Sellers rather than a smaller and fairly stable set of load-serving entities (LSEs)." <sup>6/</sup>First, As PG&E stated in our August 6 comments, all owners, operators and users of the bulk electric system are required to register with the WECC. Importers of electricity are a finite set of entities which have to meet NERC and WECC criteria, not a group with ever-changing membership. Second, the ARB has already determined that it will monitor all significant point sources in California, many more entities than there are electricity importers. Gathering data from many entities is part of the normal ARB operations, and the number of entities should not add significant complexity. Finally, the ARB has already decided correctly to have all importers of electricity report imports, regardless of the point of regulation. This decision is correct, will improve California's understanding regarding who imports electricity, from where, and if levels rise.

# The Resero paper erroneously states that in-state generation emissions data is managed in the same way under First Seller and the Load-Based Cap, thereby ignoring a huge complexity of the Load-Based Cap.

In Parts 5 and 6, Resero states identifying emissions to in-state generation should be "straightforward" under First Seller. This is correct, but for first seller only. However, the paper substantially errs in implying that the treatment of in-state emissions is exactly the same under either first seller or the load based cap. Many parties,

<sup>&</sup>lt;u>6/</u> Resero, p. 5.

Personal Parts 5 and 6: "For in-state generators, emissions data would be collected in the same way as has been proposed for Load-Based methods." p. 6; "For in in-state generation, identifying carbon emissions should be straightforward and is already the subject of extensive discussions." p. 8.

<sup>&</sup>lt;u>8/</u> Resero, p. 13

including PG&E, have described previously the administrative exercise that will have to occur to assign in-state generation dispatched through the power pool or through unspecified contracts to LSEs. By equating the treatment of in-state generation under the two schemes, Resero does not identify an enormous complexity of the load-based cap, which would highlight the overwhelming advantage of first seller for in-state generation.

## Resero correctly states that the First Seller point of regulation works with the CAISO markets and incorporates emissions costs into energy prices but fails to point out that the Load-Based Cap does not do this.

Resero properly finds that the First Seller approach should mesh well with the CAISO markets in Finding F and Part 10 of the paper. Resero is correct in stating that, under First Seller, CAISO prices "will reflect added costs of carbon management. (That is, with the proper dispatch and resulting prices);" and that "the First Seller importers should be well positioned to incorporate the costs of emissions into their energy market bids."

While the above is correct, Resero fails to note that the load-based cap does not mesh well with the CAISO markets. PG&E and others have submitted extensive comments to this effect to the PUC. Only under First Seller will all of the bids submitted to the CAISO internalize GHG costs. According to a recent report and analysis by the Market Surveillance Committee of the CAISO:

"The load-based approach will encourage self-scheduling in conflict with the efficiency potential of the MRTU markets, whereas the source-based approach will encourage economic bidding, thus utilizing MRTU's new economic dispatch in concert with GHG regulation to achieve the desired environmental objectives.

A load-based system . . . will pose a grave danger to the efficiency and competitiveness of the California short-run markets.

A load-based system would conflict with the goal of more competitive energy and ancillary services markets in California, and with the goal of creating liquid and deep markets day-ahead and in real-time in order to lower operation system costs and maximize the ability of the ISO operators manage unforeseen contingencies. In contrast, a source-based policy and MRTU would work together to lower the costs of meeting GHG goals and California's need for power." (Pg 7-8)

Dallas Burtraw of *Resources for the Future*, an independent environmental economics think-tank, adds to this argument with "It is most important for policymakers to recognize that the future of electricity markets and allowance markets are intertwined... If the goal is to increase competition—for example, through the introduction of a day-ahead market as planned, for 2008—then the load-based approach to a cap-and-trade program would pose a fundamental conflict." 10/

# Resero mistakenly attributes complications with CA's regulation of imported power with First Seller, ignoring the fact that these problems have nothing to do with the point of regulation.

Resero describes various difficulties in identifying the emissions content of electricity imports and attributes these to the First Seller approach, failing to note that these same problems occur in the Load-Based Cap or that the Load-Based Cap would ignore these problems by collecting less information about imports. Finding B states, "There is a potential for resource shuffling . . . with these First Sellers comparable to what would exist with a Load-Based approach. (See discussion item 5.)" However, in Part 5, Resero presents no argument or evidence that this is the case. Part 5 describes

Market Surveillance Committee, California Independent System Operator, "Opinion on 'Load-based and Source-based Tracking of Carbon Dioxide in California," November 27, 2007. (http://www.caiso.com/1c9d/1c9d6f661ba60.pdf), pp.7-8.

<sup>&</sup>lt;u>10</u>/ Dallas Burtraw, Resources for the Future, Discussion Paper 07-49; November, 2007 http://www.rff.org/rff/Documents/RFF-DP-07-49.pdf, p.3.

<sup>11/</sup> Resero, p.2.

the difficulty of capturing emissions information and resource shuffling potential in non-CAISO balancing authorities. In either the First Seller or the Load-Based cap approach, the problem of contract shuffling with imports exists. This will occur as long as only California has a low GHG preference and has nothing to do with the point of regulation. In either case, California will have to make a regulatory decision to determine the resources delivered to and serving California.

Part 6 claims without any validation, "For imported power, identifying the source or carbon content under a First Seller approach may be at least as challenging as doing so under a Load-Based approach." The footnote accompanying this statement says, "Under Load-Based regulation other options (such as an LSE identifying sources of power) were envisioned that could be unmanageable under a First Seller approach." Resero does not explain or provide any evidence for the claims made. All options to identify imports under the load-based cap remain under First Seller. If the LSE is the First Seller, it will be able to claim specific imports under both points of regulation, consistent with implementing rules. Additionally, First Seller will capture information from *all* importers, which the Load-Based cap will *not* do.

Finally, in Part 8, the paper claims that assessing the carbon content of imports by reviewing contracts will be more challenging under First Seller than under the Load-Based cap. Under the Load-Based cap, the imports by non-LSEs would not be directly captured, increasing the possibility of leakage. Under First Seller, all importers are captured. Reviewing contracts is necessary only for unit specific claims. Otherwise,

12/ Resero, p. 8.

13/ Resero, p. 11.

the default emissions rate will be used.

### The limitation on the use of e-tags has nothing to do with the point of regulation and should not be labeled as a First Seller pitfall.

In the conclusion, Resero states that "The paper addresses several potential pitfalls of First Seller regulation, including the lack of ability to trace specific sources using eTag information." Problems with this statement include the implication that this pitfall does not exist under the Load-Based Cap and the implication that eTag information would be used to validate unit specific claims under First Seller.

PG&E does not espouse the use of e-tags to validate unit specific claims and does not recall any other parties doing so. PG&E specifically has advocated the use of e-tags as one form of back-up documentation for imports, to be used to identify only the importer, the quantity of imports, and the broad region of imports. PG&E has suggested that unit specific claims be validated through contractual and ownership relationships only, and not through e-tags. Knowing the importing party, the amount of imports, and the region of imports is important under either point of regulation. E-tags are a tool for system reliability and scheduling and should not be modified for GHG purposes. However, they are a useful source of information to be mined for California to understand its dependence on imports.

Given the nature of the electricity market, California will need to make a regulatory decision on the emissions value and rules for unit specific claims. As purchasers of electricity do not know the source of electricity until after transactions are completed for most imports, PG&E agrees that the control area of generation on e-tags

21

<sup>&</sup>lt;u>14</u>/ Resero, p. 13.

should not be used for emissions assignment, under both the Load-Based cap and First Seller. For this reason, Finding F and the discussion on assigning emissions value to imports in Parts 7 and 10 does not adequately identify the relative merits of the First Seller/ Load-based cap alternatives.

### <u>Use of unit specific contracts to define imports is not preferential against Marketers.</u>

Finding D suggests that using contract information to assign emissions value to imports is more difficult under First Seller because the larger number of entities involved have different abilities to have unit specific contracts. Resero elaborates on this in Part 8, implying that LSEs and Marketers have differential abilities to enter into long-term unit specific contracts and ownership relationships. However, according to the ARB draft regulation, specific claims may be made for any "particular generating unit or facility whose electrical generation can be confidently tracked due to full or partial ownership or due to its identification in a power contract." There is no length qualification. Marketers and LSEs alike have equal ability to enter into these unit specific contracts. Finally, these requirements are without regard to the point of regulation, contrary to the implication in Part 8 that the assignment proposals under First Seller are more specific than those considered for the Load-Based cap.

For these reasons, PG&E believes that the Resero paper in its present form contains significant errors and omissions and should not in its present form be relied upon for evaluation of the type or point of regulation.

### 3.4.3. Source-based for In-state Generation, Load-Based for Imports

<sup>15/</sup> ARB, Proposed Regulation For Mandatory Reporting of Greenhouse Gas Emissions, 95102 (a)(166).

Under this approach, the point of regulation would be the electricity generators for in state generation and the retail providers for imported power.

### Q16. Please describe in detail your view of how this option would work.

**PG&E Response:** PG&E believes that a "hybrid" source-based/load-based system would have the following effects:

- 1. In-state sources would internalize emissions in their marginal costs. In-state electricity prices will increase.
- 2. The marginal cost of out-of-state generation will not increase. The program gives a competitive advantage to out-of-state generation. Importers, who do not have a compliance burden, will sell more power into California to take advantage of the increased price of electricity. Even if the marginal resource is the same in both markets, emissions may increase because of transmission losses.
- 3. If all generators efficiently include dispatch costs, and with in-state generators incurring GHG compliance costs while out-of-state generators do not, in-state generation may decrease and imports may increase
- 4. LSEs will have to report what part of their load is met by in-state generation.
- 5. LSEs will have to report what part of their load is met by their own imports.
- 6. The ARB will have to determine which in-state generation was not claimed and ensure no double claims.
- 7. Unclaimed in-state generation would need to be assigned to unfulfilled LSE load.
- 8. Imports would then be assigned to unfulfilled LSEs load.
- 9. The ARB would have to calculate what each LSE is responsible for, given their own imports and the marketer imports assigned to them.

### Q17. Do you support such an approach? Why or why not?

**PG&E Response:** PG&E believes that there are significant difficulties with this approach. It has advantages over a load based cap in that in-state generation has an increased chance of dispatch in the correct order. However, even in this approach, entities without compliance responsibility can make the import decision; in-state generation and imports will have to be assigned to load; and the ARB will have to make a regulatory decision on LSE responsibility. This option has less chance of leakage than a pure source based cap or a load based cap, but has a higher chance of leakage than First Seller or national source-based approaches.

Q18. Does this approach have legal issues associated with it? Provide a detailed analysis and legal citations.

PG&E Response: ARB has discretion to adopt emissions reductions measures and strategies that achieve AB 32's GHG reduction goals consistent with the economic and technological feasibility criteria and other statutory criteria listed in AB 32. Thus, all else being equal, a hybrid source-based/load-based system would appear to comply with AB 32 if it is otherwise consistent with AB 32's economic and technological criteria. A hybrid source-based/load-based system would be evaluated under the Commerce Clause to the U.S. Constitution based on whether it treats out-of-state sources of power on a non-discriminatory basis compared to in-state sources. This determination would be largely fact-based and would focus on whether the direct or indirect effects of the emissions standards adopted would treat out-of-state sources no more stringently than in-state sources.

Q19. If retail providers are responsible for internalizing the cost of carbon for imported power, all power generated in-state may need to be tracked to load to avoid double regulation of in-state power. Do you agree?

**PG&E Response:** In this option, the cost of carbon would not be internalized in the cost of imported electricity. The cost of carbon would be paid by LSEs after power is purchased. The ARB would have to assign responsibility for imports based on an administrative decision. In order to make this administrative decision, the ARB would have to track all in-state generation to load, a task that PG&E believes would not be feasible and thus would result in double counting and double regulation problems.

Q20. If that is the case, does a mixed source-based/loadbased approach offer any advantages compared to a load-based approach in terms of simplifying reporting and tracking? What if the load-based system uses TEACs? How could imports be differentiated from in-state generation in a way that reduces the complexity of reporting and tracking compared to a load-based approach?

PG&E Response: In terms of reporting and tracking, the mixed source-based/ load-based for imports approach does have some advantages over the pure load based cap.

In-state reporting and tracking are simpler and more accurate for in-state resources. A TEACs system offers no further advantage even if restricted to imports, because the ARB would still have to determine the import responsibility for each LSE. The best way to reduce the complexity of reporting and tracking for imports is to assign responsibility for the imports at their source or at the time they are delivered into California and not attempt to track the imports to specific load served.

#### 3.5. Deferral of a Market-based Cap-and-Trade System

In this scenario, a California-only cap-and-trade system would not be implemented for the electricity sector at this time. Instead, California would work with other Western states to develop a Western Climate Initiative cap-and-trade system and/or work toward a national cap-and-trade program. In the meantime, existing policies and programs in the electricity sector may need to be ramped up to meet the AB 32 goals. Several variations of this option may be possible. For example, a loadbased cap could still be developed for retail providers, with assignment of individual entity obligations and trading available within the California electricity sector only, but not with other sectors. A second alternative would be to develop individual entity caps (or carbon budgets) which entities could not exceed without facing penalties or fees, but not allow for any trading of allowances at this time. Another option would be to ramp up the mandatory levels of

existing programs such as the energy efficiency and RPS programs to higher goals, and make all retail providers obligated to meet these additional goals, without assigning specific cap levels to individual entities.

Q21. How important is it that a cap-and-trade system be included in the near-term as part of the electricity sector's AB 32 compliance strategy?

PG&E Response: PG&E believes that a cap-and-trade market-based system for regulating GHG emissions, if designed properly, offers better opportunities over both the near term and long term for achieving cost-effective and sustained GHG reductions than other forms of regulation, such as "command and control" emissions limits. For this reason, PG&E believes that it is essential that a cap-and-trade system be considered as part of the electric sector's AB 32 compliance strategy. Nonetheless, if it becomes more likely than not that a national source-based system will be adopted and implemented within the same general time period as AB 32, then there could be significant advantages and efficiencies in California deferring adoption of a cap-and-trade market structure in the short period prior to that national system. As discussed above in response to questions 9 and 10, an in-state only source-based system, with deferral of regulation of imports, could be viable as a means of bridging to a national source-based system, because the threat of long term shifting of generation to out-of-state sources would be significantly mitigated by the imminence of the national system.

Q22. Would your answer to Q12 be different if there is no market-based cap-and-trade system? If so, please explain.

**PG&E Response:** PG&E's response to Question 12 would not be different. Regulation of non-IOU LSEs would still need to be addressed.

Q24. How deferral of a cap-and-trade program for the electricity sector would facilitate or hinder California's integration into a subsequent regional or federal program.

**PG&E Response:** Deferring adoption of a source based cap-and-trade program in California is more likely to facilitate California's integration into a subsequent federal program. A load-based cap may hinder such integration. However, we do believe that the example that California sets by adopting a smoothly functioning source-based or first seller-based cap-and-trade program can serve to encourage federal action.

A key integration issue is the transferability of allowances from a state to a federal program. Inability to transfer such allowance may cause significant integration issues and be very costly to complying entities and to LSE's customers.

Q25. If neither a regional system nor a national system is implemented within a reasonable timeframe, should California proceed with implementing its own capand-trade system for the electricity sector? If so, how long should California wait for other systems to develop before acting alone?

PG&E Response: Absent a change in the legislative mandate in AB 32, California is required to proceed with implementing its own state-only compliance program, regardless of whether a regional or national system will be implemented within a reasonable timeframe. However, if no national system is likely to be enacted within the same time frame as AB 32, e.g. by 2012, then California may need to consider deferring the cap-and-trade component of the AB 32 program until source-based GHG programs are in place elsewhere in Western regional power markets. This is because the costs, inefficiencies and "leakage" associated with a state-only GHG program in the electricity sector may effectively negate the net emissions reductions sought to be realized under such a program.

Q26. What flexible compliance mechanisms could be integrated into a non-market based GHG emission reduction approach?

**PG&E Response:** A program of GHG offsets could be integrated into a non-market

based reduction program, such as the adoption of individual entity caps, although PG&E's preference would be to see a cap-and-trade program adopted. For example, offsets have been used by companies to satisfy voluntary reduction commitments outside of any cap-and-trade scheme.

Q27. If a market-based cap-and-trade system is not implemented for the electricity sector in 2012, how would you recommend addressing early actions that entities may have undertaken in anticipation of a market?

PG&E Response: PG&E supports the adoption of a market-based cap-and-trade system in California, and believes that it is reasonable to have a program in place by 2012. However, if implementation of such a system is delayed and entities have undertaken measures in anticipation of such a market-based system, these early actions should be recognized through an equitable distribution of allowances once the market-based system is in place. Allowances should not be allocated on the basis of historical emissions because such an allocation scheme would penalize and discourage early actions.

### 3.6. Recommendation and Comparison of Alternatives

Q28. Submit your comprehensive proposal for the approach California should utilize regarding the point of regulation and whether California should implement a cap-and-trade program at this time for the electricity sector. If you recommend that another approach be considered besides those detailed above, propose it here. If you recommend one of the above options, give as detailed a discussion as possible of how the approach would work.

**PG&E Response:** PG&E's first and foremost preference is a national source-based, multi-sector cap and trade approach with a WECC-wide regional source-based approach as a second option. Under a multi-sector, California only cap and trade system, PG&E supports a First Seller approach. PG&E previously provided extensive comments and analysis of the First Seller approach in our August 6 and 15, 2007, comments in this

proceeding and will not repeat those comments here.

The First Seller approach can be summarized as follows:

- 1. In-state generators and importers report emissions data per the ARB reporting regulations. Importer emissions responsibility is determined through the ARB protocol. Under AB 32, CARB will require all applicable entities registered in the WECC (LSEs and marketers) to report their import-based emissions if they import power into California for ultimate consumption in California. E-tags will not be turned into the ARB but can be used for back-up documentation for independent reporting auditors.
- First sellers purchase allowances from LSEs through an independent mechanism or agency.
- Value of the allowances is used for customer benefit, such as offsetting customer costs.

Other details about trading mechanisms should be developed after the point of regulation is chosen.

Q29. Address and compare how each of the alternatives identified in the above questions, and the proposal you submit in response to the preceding question, would perform relative to each of the principles or objectives listed above and any other principles or objectives you propose. For each alternative, address important tradeoffs among the principles.

### **PG&E Response:**

In our previous comments in this proceeding, PG&E has extensively analyzed and compared the First Seller approach to the Load-Based Cap approach, and has concluded that the First Seller approach is superior to the Load-Based Cap in its ability

to achieve most of the key principles and objectives listed above. PG&E does not intend to repeat this comparison and analysis in these comments, but incorporates our previous comments and analysis in this proceeding by reference. 16/

In terms of all the alternatives or variations on the First Seller and Load-Based Cap approaches identified in this ALJs Ruling, PG&E believes that the key variable to consider is whether a national GHG system is likely to be implemented within the same general time frame as AB 32. PG&E believes the answer is yes, a national GHG system is likely to be in place in the same general time frame as implementation of AB 32, and therefore two of the alternatives listed in this ALJs Ruling (in-state only source-based, and programmatic implementation of AB 32 pending adoption of a national program) could be evaluated further for implementing AB 32 prior to the effective date of the national program.

Even if a national program is likely in the short term, PG&E would have concerns about adoption of two other alternatives identified by the ALJs Ruling (hybrid load-based cap/source-based cap, and expansion of the SB 1368 emission performance standard or other procurement restrictions). This is because both of these alternatives provide for significant reliance on a "load-based" approach to limiting GHG emissions, which is subject to the same or similar distortions and defects PG&E has identified with the Load-Based Cap approach.

If a national program is not adopted or is rejected for whatever reason, then PG&E would recommend that California move forward with the First Seller approach, while at the same time increasing and accelerating its efforts to establish a regional

<sup>16/</sup> PG&E Opening and Reply Comments on First Seller Issues, August 6 and 15, 2007.

system, the First Seller approach would allow California to move ahead in achieving significant GHG reductions in the electric sector without waiting for a regional source-based system. At the same time, the First Seller approach would ensure that California could quickly and efficiently convert its program to a regional source-based cap-and-trade program in the West, with the least amount of administrative complexity and incompatibility. Finally, since global warming is a global issue, PG&E recommends in this instance that California redouble its efforts to encourage a support a national based cap-and-trade system to effectively address this problem on the scale it needs to be addressed.

PG&E provides the following comments on how each of the alternatives in the ALJs Ruling can be evaluated and compared using the key policy principles listed in Question 3:

## LOAD BASED CAP USING A TRACKING SYSTEM BASED ON CONTRACTS AND SETTLEMENTS

The following quote from the CAISO's Market Surveillance Committee (MSC) summarizes the deficiencies of the Load-Based Cap option:

"...a load-based cap-and-trade system, is clearly and substantially inferior to the other options. We believe that the load and source-based approaches are similar in some respects, but that the load-based approach is distinctly inferior in others. In particular, we argue that the two systems are essentially the same on the issues of determining the GHG content of power imports and incentives for investments in energy efficiency and renewable energy. However, in terms of administrative complexity, adverse impacts on the efficiency and costs of dispatching generation units to meet load in California energy and ancillary services markets, and compatibility with likely federal GHG legislation, a load-based system has serious disadvantages compared to any of the other options. Contrary to some claims, we believe that resulting cost of energy to consumers would likely be

- higher under a load-based cap." 17/
- Cost minimization: The Load-Based cap may have higher costs than a source-based system.
- As 1,100 lbs/ MWh is likely higher than the average emissions rate of power serving the power pool, customers will pay more for any transaction that is not unit-specific, and the quantity of generation to which this high default emission rate will be applied is greater than under a first seller or source-based approach.
- ➤ Running counter to objectives of the MRTU, there will be a tendency to do more unit-specific contracts with low emitting generation, which will increase overall procurement costs, possibly affect contract performance assurance, and possibly lead to scheduling problems and inefficient dispatch.
- Administrative costs may be great and will also impact customer costs. The sunk costs of the tracking system will be in all likelihood no longer be useful in the transition to the federal source-based system.
- Compatibility with wholesale markets and the MRTU: Under a load based cap, the costs of GHGs will not be included in the price of electricity for economic dispatch purposes. Since economic dispatch is one of the foundational purposes of the MRTU, a load based cap would undermine MRTU's effectiveness. In addition, one effect of the MRTU may be fewer unit-specific contracts, since more units will bid into a pool, improving market efficiency. Under a load based cap, however, LSEs may prefer bilateral contracts

Market Surveillance Committee of the California Independent System Operator, "Opinion on 'Load-Based and Source-Based Trading of Carbon Dioxide in California," November 27, 2007, pp. 2-3.

particularly if the default emissions rate is set at a high or unpredictable level.

This also will frustrate the MRTU goal of a more efficient market.

### Environmental Integrity:

- Importers and other sellers bidding into the California power market would have no compliance obligation and would, therefore, not reflect any GHG compliance costs in their electricity bid prices.
- Since GHG costs will not be included in generators' bids into the Integrated Forward Market, the CAISO will not be able to dispatch bids or curtail generation based on all economic inputs, because the GHG emissions price is not included. Over time, this may significantly affect actual day-to-day emissions quantities if dispatch does not reflect GHG costs.
- Leakage may occur as default emission rates are used over actual emissions rates.
- According to Dallas Burtraw of Resources for the Future, the load-based approach will fail to deliver incentives for technological innovation.
- ➤ Expandability: The Load-based cap neither is expandable nor can it act as a model for the nation. The complications of tracking imports and exports under a multiple state load-based cap regime would become monumental, especially if stated differ on the value of imports and exports. The administrative burden to solve such issues would be intense. Further the implementation of a Load-based cap in California would fail to influence the national source based cap and would hamper California's ability to transition. To quote the CAISO's Market Surveillance Committee:

This conclusion means that a fully effective GHG policy for the electric sector must cover the bulk of the western US market. This implies that a California policy under AB32 should be viewed as an initial step, and that a major goal of that policy should be to facilitate the establishment and implementation of federal or other west-wide policies, rather than to act as an obstacle to such policies. Precedent, as well as the preponderance of proposed federal legislation, indicates that source-based trading of emissions allowances will likely be the basis of any federal regulation of power sector GHG emissions. The emissions accounting and other mechanisms associated with a California load-based system would, at best, be sunk costs that would be abandoned if a federal source-based GHG trading system is adopted. At worst, the existence of an incompatible state-level system could delay or increase the cost of implementing the federal system. <sup>18</sup>/

- ➤ **Accuracy**: The load-based approach introduces complexity and imprecision in making an assignment of emissions to generation that occurs in the state as well as out of state. (Burtraw 15)<sup>19/</sup>
- None of the load based cap options track who imports power nor how much power is imported. Load serving entities often are not the entities who import the power into California.
- The load based cap necessitates some methodology for assigning emissions from facilities and imports to LSEs, perhaps through default emissions values. This introduces imprecision, uncertainty, chance for error and greater incentive for gaming in the emissions of the complying entity, the LSE. The imprecision of the load based cap introduces increased uncertainty to the measurement of emissions reductions actions taken by the LSE for its load.

Market Surveillance Committee of the California Independent System Operator, "Opinion on 'Load-Based and Source-Based Trading of Carbon Dioxide in California," November 27, 2007, pp. 2-4.

<sup>19/</sup> Dallas Burtraw, Resources for the Future, Discussion Paper 07-49; November, 2007

- Any attempts to assign or track generation, whether generated in state or imported, to load will depend on a policy decision, like averaging emissions in the pool or the use of disaggregate emissions attributes. The technical or database solution to match generation that runs through a pool to particular load does not exist. Neither California not the WECC should expect that a feasible, accurate tracking system that can track electricity flow through a multitude of transactions and repackaging will be developed in the near future without a host of simplifying assumptions, thereby inherently inaccurate.
- Administrative: The state will have to undergo an exercise to determine which generation has been claimed by LSEs and which goes into the general pool.

  Because this process may be complicated and contentious, it may be administratively costly.

# LOAD BASED CAP USING TEACS

While the TEACs option would integrate better with the wholesale markets, and be more accurate than the original Load-based Cap, the high start-up costs, administrative complexities, and market complexities far outweigh potential advantages. Additionally, TEACs would not be likely to serve as a national model.

- ➤ Cost minimization: Theoretically the costs should be the same as first seller.

  However, implementing TEACs would require huge up front costs to create the infrastructure for the trading platform.
- **Compatibility with wholesale markets and the MRTU:**
- ➤ The TEACs system could internalize the value of low GHG emitting generation in the dispatch decision by decreasing the marginal cost of lower emitting

- resources more than it decreases the cost of higher emitting resources. Unlike the other options of the load based cap, it is possible to maintain least cost dispatch with this option. TEACs also solve the problem of the power pool, giving utilities control over their emissions profile.
- ➤ If some LSEs in WECC are not subject to the load-based program, but all generators are included, there will be surplus TEACs. In that case, some coal-based TEACs will go unassigned. The solution is unpalatable: Arbitrarily exclude some generators from the TEAC scheme, so that the supply of TEACs matches demand served by LSEs under load-based caps.
- Entities would have to trade in three different markets: the energy market, the TEACs market, and the allowance market. Creating such a complicated system of markets might discourage active participation by a variety of entities.

  Additionally, the layers of markets increase the opportunities for arbitrage.
- ➤ Environmental Integrity: The environmental integrity could be compromised if all generation in the WECC receives TEACs while only some LSEs are subject to the load-based cap.
- Expandability: The national system will be source based. California would have to spend a large amount of money to create an incompatible system that would have to be dismantled in fairly short order and lose the ability to scale up its system and influence the national design.
- ➤ Accuracy: Since all imports and in-state generation has to be tracked to create all of the TEACs, this option should be accurate.

➤ **Administrative:** Administratively more complex as the extra trading platform has to be created and then monitored.

# IN-STATE SOURCE BASED CAP ONLY

This option is administratively the easiest and is expandable. However, this option is more costly than First Seller and may cause increased imports.

- Cost minimization: As in-state generation internalizes emissions in the marginal cost, in-state electricity prices will increase. The marginal cost of out-of-state generation will not increase. Importers, who do not have a compliance burden, will sell more power into California to take advantage of the increased price of electricity. The program gives a competitive advantage to out-of-state generation. Thus, money will flow out of state to marketers who do not have to buy allowances. California will face increased electricity prices while internalizing less GHGs. Additional expenditures would have to occur above the increased electricity prices for the programmatic measures to account for the GHG in the imports.
- Compatibility with wholesale markets and the MRTU: If there is economically efficient dispatch, in-state generation should decrease and imports will increase. While in-state dispatch may be relatively efficient, this option is inefficient because only the in-state generation has internalized the GHG price.
- ➤ Environmental Integrity: Under a pure source based cap for California generation, it is likely that imports will increase. Whether these imports may be more GHG intensive that the in-state power being displaced is unclear, since coal

dispatch will be unchanged. Even if the marginal resource is the same in both markets, emissions may increase because of transmission losses.

- **Expandability**: This option is easily expandable to the federal system.
- ➤ Accuracy: The option is accurate because there is no need to match generation to load, but the option does not account at all for imports
- **Administrative:** Administratively easiest option.

# IN-STATE SOURCE BASED CAP WITH A LOAD BASED CAP FOR IMPORTS

There are significant difficulties with this approach. It is better than a pure load based cap in that in-state generation has an increased chance of dispatch in the correct order. However, even in this approach, entities without compliance responsibility can make the import decision; in-state generation and imports will have to be assigned to load; and the ARB will have to make a regulatory decision on LSE responsibility. This option has less chance of leakage than a pure source based cap or the load based cap, but has increased chance of leakage than the first seller approach.

# **Cost minimization:**

As in-state generation internalizes emissions in the marginal cost, in-state electricity prices will increase. The marginal cost of out-of-state generation may not increase commensurately. Importers do not have a compliance and corresponding cost burden, and may sell more power into California to take advantage of the increased price of electricity. This approach therefore gives a competitive advantage to out-of-state generation, and funds will flow out of state to marketers who do not have to buy allowances. California will face increased electricity prices while internalizing less GHGs. Additional expenditures would

have to occur above the increased electricity prices for the programmatic measures to account for the GHG in the imports.

# > Compatibility with wholesale markets and the MRTU:

If there is economically efficient dispatch, instate generation should decrease and imports will increase. While in-state dispatch should be efficient, this option is inefficient because only the in-state generation has internalized the GHG price.

- Environmental Integrity: As under a pure source based cap for California generation, there is an almost certain probability that imports will increase.

  Whether these imports are much more GHG intensive that the in-state power being displaced is unclear, since coal dispatch will be unchanged. Even if the marginal resource is the same in both markets, emissions may increase because of transmission losses.
- Expandability: This option is expandable to the federal system, with the imports component replaced by a broad source-based system.
- Accuracy: The ARB will have to undergo the inaccurate administrative process of assigning all generation to LSEs to determine the LSEs' imports responsibility. LSEs that import a great deal of power may try to leave importing to marketers, hoping that imports responsibility gets spread out over all LSEs.
- Administrative: The ARB would have to assign responsibility for imports based on an administrative decision. In order to make this administrative decision, the ARB would have to track all in-state generation to load. LSE compliance responsibility would depend on these later regulatory outcomes, adding significant and unnecessary uncertainty.

#### FIRST SELLER

While PG&E may prefer a national or WECC wide source-based approach, the First Seller option should be pursued in a California only multi sector scenario.

➤ Cost minimization: This option should have equal to lower costs than all of the other options considered. It integrates GHG costs into the electricity market efficiently without creating an excessively burdensome administrative system.

# Compatibility with wholesale markets and the MRTU:

- 1. The deliverer/first-seller option provides a more effective response to leakage by directly internalizing the GHG compliance costs in both in-state generation and imports. In-state California generators will reflect the cost of GHG allowances in their electricity bid prices submitted to the California ISO. Similarly, importers of electricity— responsible for surrendering allowances under the deliverer/first-seller approach—will factor these costs into their decision to import power.
- 2. First Seller provides direct price signals to utilities and other power sellers.

# Environmental Integrity:

- 1. Because all parties include GHG costs, environmental dispatch is possible.
- First Seller requires default emissions rates only for unspecified imports, and therefore minimizes leakage
- The first seller approach aligns the regulation of in-state sources of GHG
  emissions with the ability to track responsibility for those emissions under AB
   because in-state sources would comply with AB 32 emissions requirements directly.

Expandability: This option is expandable to the federal system which is likely to be source based.

# > Accuracy:

- 1. Of the proposals being considered, the First Seller approach is the only proposal that regulates all imports. None of the other proposals will capture all of the entities that decide to import power into California.
- 2. This option is more accurate because it allows more accurate monitoring and assignment of emissions, reducing the scope of line of sight problems for imports because transactions do not need tracking after in-state delivery occurs.

# > Administrative

- 1. The best way to reduce the complexity of reporting and tracking for imports is to assign responsibility for the imports at the time they are delivered into California and not attempt to track the imports to specific load served.
- 2. The list of potential importers is easily known.

#### PROGRAMMATIC MEASURES ONLY

This option may be more costly, inaccurate, and administratively complex than a market based mechanism, depending on the design of the market based mechanism. On the other hand, this option may reasonably transition California well for the coming national source-based market.

Cost minimization: This option is more costly than a market based mechanism.
California will have to bear the costs of increased programmatic measures and will be much less able to use efficiencies and innovations of a market-based approach.

- ➤ Compatibility with wholesale markets and the MRTU: This option is incompatible with environmental dispatch as importers and in-state generators will not internalize GHG costs. However, dispatch should be economic and not counter to MRTU goals.
- > Environmental Integrity: May be difficult to determine, as avoided emissions will not be perfectly quantifiable.
- ➤ Expandability: While this option is not incompatible with a federal system, it is not expandable and does not provide a comprehensive, market-based model for the nation.
- **Accuracy**: Avoided emissions will not be perfectly quantifiable.
- ➤ **Administrative**: Increased administrative burden and costs as each programmatic measure must be monitored.

# CO2RCs

CO2RCs are a more complicated version of TEACs. The concept is more confusing, unnecessarily complex, and totally unworkable in a California only context.

#### **Cost minimization:**

The CO2RCs approach apparently assumes that if certain WECC states participate in the WCI but other states do not, the LSEs in the WCI states should absorb all of the CO2RCs in the WECC, sending money from WCI states to non-WCI states. This entails punitive, costly action against those states that do decide to pursue GHG regulation in the WCI, raising barrier for states to desire to do so.

# **Compatibility with wholesale markets and the MRTU:**

- The electricity market prices of CO2RCs would need to be carefully considered. CO2RCs may impact prices in non-WCI states with unknown ramifications.
- The idea may possibly work for vertically integrated utilities but does not function at all for the California marketplace. The CO2RCs concept does not work with merchant generation and a power pool integrated forward market.

# **Environmental Integrity**:

- A CO2RC does not actually represent a reduction. CO2RCs are granted to all generators whose emissions rates are less than 2200 lbs/ MWH. A generator with an emissions rate slightly below that rate, for example 2000 lbs/ MWH would earn more CO2RCs by producing more electricity and emitting more GHG into the atmosphere.
- If all generators in the WECC receive CO2RCs, then there would be a
  huge oversupply in a California only system. There is no substantiation
  that CO2RCs would solve the leakage problem.
- Assuming total WECC generation is 831,570 GWH, at an average emissions rate of 0.5 mtons/ MWH, over 415 MILLION CO2RCs would need to be created. (Just to be clear, what units are CO2RCs?)

# > Expandability:

- It is unlikely that CO2RCs will be able to link seamlessly with the EU and RGGI. This is because rather than being a fixed quantity, like an allowance, more CO2RCs are created with increased electricity generation and increased emissions.
- CO2RCs are unlikely to be a model for a source-based national system in which emissions allowances are traded instead of CO2RCs.

# > Accuracy:

If total generation and demand grow, the total CO2RCs awarded will grow. To control emissions under such a scenario demands a much more hands-on regulatory approach to the GHG cap. One solution suggested to this is to devalue the CO2RC if too many are produced. This would signify that CO2RCs produced in different years would have different values. Unlike an allowance where a ton is a ton, a CO2RC in one year would not necessarily be equivalent to a CO2RC in another year. This could create confusion in the market place and make valuation of the assets complicated.

# > Administrative

Requiring CO2RC generation to show WCI load based contracts to earn
 CO2RCs means that generation has to be tied to load. If that were easily possible, CO2RCs would not be needed at all.

The CO2RC method would involve many administrative decisions and would have to be managed in a hands-on fashion. An administrative decision would have to be made to decide how participating states would absorb the extra CO2RCs. Not allocating CO2RCs to generation serving non-WCI load would require the very tracking of generation to load the CO2RCs approach purports to avoid.

# IV. CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above PG&E recommends that the CPUC and Energy Commission adopt and recommend the policies on type and point of regulation under AB 32 as described in PG&E's comments in this proceeding.

Respectfully Submitted,
CHRISTOPHER J. WARNER

By:	/s/	
	CHRISTOPHER J. WARNER	

Pacific Gas and Electric Company 77 Beale Street San Francisco, CA 94105 Telephone: (415) 973-6695

Facsimile: (415) 972-5220 E-Mail: CJW5@pge.com

Attorneys for PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

Dated: December 3, 2007

# **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that I have this day served a copy of "OPENING COMMENTS OF PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY (U 39 E) ON TYPE AND POINT OF REGULATION ISSUES UNDER AB 32" on the parties listed in the official service list for R.06-04-009 by

- transmitting an e-mail message with the document attached to each party on the official service list providing an email address; or
- by first-class mail, postage prepaid, to each party on the official service list not providing an email address.

Executed on December 3, 2007, at San Francisco, California.



Downloaded December 3, 2007, last updated on November 30, 2007 Commissioner Assigned: Michael R. Peevey on April 17, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Charlotte TerKeurst on September 19, 2006; ALJ Assigned: Jonathan Lakritz on May 9, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Meg Gottstein on April 17, 2006

#### CPUC DOCKET NO. R0604009

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Implement the Commission's Procurement Incentive Framework and to Examine the Integration of Greenhouse Gas Emissions Standards into Procurement Policies.

Rulemaking 06-04-009

abb@eslawfirm.com;abonds@thelen.com;achang@nrdc.org;adamb@greenlining.org;aeg@cpuc.ca.gov;agc@cpuc.ca.gov;agrimaldi@mckennalong.com;aimee.barnes@ecosecurities.com;ajkatz@mwe.com;akbar.jazayeri@sce.com;akelly@climatetrust.org;alan.comnes@nrgenergy.com;aldyn.hoekstra@paceglobal.com;alho@pge.com;amber@ethree.com;amsmith@sempra.com;andrew.bradford@constellation.com;andrew.mcallister@energycenter.org;andy.vanhorn@vhcenergy.com;anita.hart@swgas.com;annabelle.malins@fco.gov.uk;Anne-

Marie\_Madison@TransAlta.com;annette.gilliam@sce.com;apak@sempraglobal.com;arno@recurrentener gy.com;atrial@sempra.com;atrowbridge@daycartermurphy.com;Audra.Hartmann@Dynegy.com;aweller @sel.com;bbaker@summitblue.com;bbeebe@smud.org;bblevins@energy.state.ca.us;bcragg@goodinmacbride.com;bdicapo@caiso.com;bernardo@braunlegal.com;beth@beth411.com;Betty.Seto@kema.com;bill.chen@constellation.com;bill.schrand@swgas.com;bjeider@ci.burbank.ca.us;bjl@bry.com;bjones@mjbradley.com;bkc7@pge.com;blm@cpuc.ca.gov;bmcc@mccarthylaw.com;bmcquown@reliant.com;Bob.lucas@calobby.com;bpotts@foley.com;bpurewal@water.ca.gov;brabe@umich.edu;brbarkovich@earthlink.net;BRBc@pge.com;brenda.lemay@horizonwind.com;burtraw@rff.org;bushinskyj@pewclimate.org;bwallerstein@aqmd.gov;C\_Marnay@lbl.gov;cadams@covantaenergy.com;californiadockets@pacificorp.com;carla.peterman@gmail.com;carter@ieta.org;case.admin@sce.com;cathy.karlstad@sce.com;cbaskette@enernoc.com;cbreidenich@yahoo.com;cchen@ucsusa.org;cem@newsdata.com;cf1@cpuc.ca.gov;cft@cpuc.ca.gov;charlie.blair@delta-

ee.com;chilen@sppc.com;cjw5@pge.com;ckmitchell1@sbcglobal.net;ckrupka@mwe.com;clarence.binninger@doj.ca.gov;clark.bernier@rlw.com;clyde.murley@comcast.net;cmkehrein@ems-

ca.com;colin.petheram@att.com;cpe@cpuc.ca.gov;cpechman@powereconomics.com;cswoollums@mid american.com;curt.barry@iwpnews.com;curtis.kebler@gs.com;Cynthia.A.Fonner@constellation.com;cynt hia.schultz@pacificorp.com;daking@sempra.com;Dan.adler@calcef.org;danskopec@gmail.com;dansvec @hdo.net;dave@ppallc.com;david.zonana@doj.ca.gov;david@branchcomb.com;david@nemtzow.com;d avidreynolds@ncpa.com;dbrooks@nevp.com;deb@a-

klaw.com;deborah.slon@doj.ca.gov;dehling@klng.com;derek@climateregistry.org;dhecht@sempratradin g.com;dhuard@manatt.com;diane\_fellman@fpl.com;dietrichlaw2@earthlink.net;dil@cpuc.ca.gov;dkk@es lawfirm.com;dks@cpuc.ca.gov;dmacmull@water.ca.gov;dmetz@energy.state.ca.us;dniehaus@semprauti lities.com;douglass@energyattorney.com;dseperas@calpine.com;dsh@cpuc.ca.gov;dsoyars@sppc.com; dtibbs@aes4u.com;dwang@nrdc.org;dwood8@cox.net;dws@r-c-s-

inc.com;echiang@elementmarkets.com;edm@cpuc.ca.gov;egw@a-

klaw.com;ehadley@reupower.com;ej wright@oxy.com;ek@a-

klaw.com;ekgrubaugh@iid.com;ELL5@pge.com;elvine@lbl.gov;emahlon@ecoact.org;emello@sppc.com;epoole@adplaw.com;epowers@arb.ca.gov;e-

recipient@caiso.com;etiedemann@kmtg.com;ewolfe@resero.com;ez@pointcarbon.com;farrokh.albuyeh @oati.net;fiji.george@elpaso.com;filings@a-

klaw.com;fjs@cpuc.ca.gov;fstern@summitblue.com;fwmonier@tid.org;gbarch@knowledgeinenergy.com; gblue@enxco.com;george.hopley@barcap.com;ghinners@reliant.com;GloriaB@anzaelectric.org;glw@es lawfirm.com;gmorris@emf.net;gpickering@navigantconsulting.com;gregory.koiser@constellation.com;grosenblum@caiso.com;gsmith@adamsbroadwell.com;gxl2@pge.com;harveyederpspc.org@hotmail.com;h

ayley@turn.org;hcronin@water.ca.gov;hgolub@nixonpeabody.com;hoerner@redefiningprogress.org;hs1 @cpuc.ca.gov;hurlock@water.ca.gov;HYao@SempraUtilities.com;hym@cpuc.ca.gov;info@calseia.org;ja ck.burke@energycenter.org;james.keating@bp.com;janill.richards@doj.ca.gov;jarmstrong@goodinmacbr ide.com;jason.dubchak@niskags.com;jbf@cpuc.ca.gov;jbw@slwplc.com;jchamberlin@strategicenergy.com;jci@cpuc.ca.gov;JDF1@PGE.COM;jdh@eslawfirm.com;jdoll@arb.ca.gov;jeanne.sole@sfgov.org;jeffgr ay@dwt.com;jen@cnt.org;jenine.schenk@apses.com;jennifer.porter@energycenter.org;JerryL@abag.ca.gov;jesus.arredondo@nrgenergy.com;jf2@cpuc.ca.gov;jgill@caiso.com;jgreco@caithnessenergy.com;jhahn@covantaenergy.com;jimross@r-c-s-

inc.com;jj.prucnal@swgas.com;jjensen@kirkwood.com;jk1@cpuc.ca.gov;jkarp@winston.com;jkloberdanz @semprautilities.com;jlaun@apogee.net;jleslie@luce.com;jluckhardt@downeybrand.com;jm3@cpuc.ca.gov;jnm@cpuc.ca.gov;jody\_london\_consulting@earthlink.net;Joe.paul@dynegy.com;john.hughes@sce.com;johnrredding@earthlink.net;jol@cpuc.ca.gov;josephhenri@hotmail.com;joyw@mid.org;jsanders@caiso.com;jscancarelli@flk.com;jsqueri@gmssr.com;jst@cpuc.ca.gov;jtp@cpuc.ca.gov;julie.martin@bp.com;jwiedman@goodinmacbride.com;jwmctarnaghan@duanemorris.com;jxa2@pge.com;karen@klindh.com;kar la.dailey@cityofpaloalto.org;Kathryn.Wig@nrgenergy.com;kbowen@winston.com;kcolburn@symbioticstrategies.com;kdusel@navigantconsulting.com;kdw@woodruff-expert-

services.com;keith.mccrea@sablaw.com;kellie.smith@sen.ca.gov;kelly.barr@srpnet.com;ken.alex@doj.ca.gov;ken.alex@doj.ca.gov;kenneth.swain@navigantconsulting.com;kerry.hattevik@mirant.com;kevin.boudreaux@calpine.com;kfox@wsgr.com;kgough@calpine.com;kgrenfell@nrdc.org;kgriffin@energy.state.ca.us;kjinnovation@earthlink.net;kjsimonsen@ems-

ca.com;kkhoja@thelenreid.com;klatt@energyattorney.com;kmills@cfbf.com;kmkiener@fox.net;kowalews kia@calpine.com;krd@cpuc.ca.gov;kyle.l.davis@pacificorp.com;kyle.silon@ecosecurities.com;kyle\_boud reaux@fpl.com;lars@resource-

solutions.org;Laura.Genao@sce.com;lcottle@winston.com;ldecarlo@energy.state.ca.us;leilani.johnson@ladwp.com;liddell@energyattorney.com;lisa.c.schwartz@state.or.us;lisa\_weinzimer@platts.com;llorenz@semprautilities.com;llund@commerceenergy.com;lmh@eslawfirm.com;Lorraine.Paskett@ladwp.com;lpark@navigantconsulting.com;lrdevanna-

rf@cleanenergysystems.com;lrm@cpuc.ca.gov;lschavrien@semprautilities.com;ltenhope@energy.state.c a.us;ltt@cpuc.ca.gov;marcel@turn.org;marcie.milner@shell.com;mary.lynch@constellation.com;mclaughl in@braunlegal.com;mdjoseph@adamsbroadwell.com;mflorio@turn.org;mgarcia@arb.ca.gov;mhyams@s fwater.org;Mike@alpinenaturalgas.com;mjd@cpuc.ca.gov;mmattes@nossaman.com;mmazur@3phases Renewables.com;monica.schwebs@bingham.com;mpa@a-

klaw.com;mpryor@energy.state.ca.us;mrw@mrwassoc.com;mscheibl@arb.ca.gov;mwaugh@arb.ca.gov;nenbar@energy-insights.com;ner@cpuc.ca.gov;nes@a-klaw.com;nlenssen@energy-

insights.com;norman.furuta@navy.mil;notice@psrec.coop;npedersen@hanmor.com;nsuetake@turn.org;nwhang@manatt.com;obartho@smud.org;obystrom@cera.com;ofoote@hkcf-

law.com;pbarthol@energy.state.ca.us;pburmich@arb.ca.gov;pduvair@energy.state.ca.us;pepper@clean powermarkets.com;phanschen@mofo.com;Philip.H.Carver@state.or.us;philm@scdenergy.com;pjazayeri @stroock.com;ppettingill@caiso.com;pseby@mckennalong.com;psp@cpuc.ca.gov;pssed@adelphia.net; pstoner@lgc.org;pthompson@summitblue.com;pvallen@thelen.com;pw1@cpuc.ca.gov;pzs@cpuc.ca.go v;rachel@ceert.org;ralph.dennis@constellation.com;ram@cpuc.ca.gov;randy.howard@ladwp.com;randy. sable@swgas.com;rapcowart@aol.com;rhelgeson@scppa.org;RHHJ@pge.com;rhwiser@lbl.gov;richards@mid.org;rick\_noger@praxair.com;rita@ritanortonconsulting.com;rkeen@manatt.com;rkmoore@gswater .com;rmccann@umich.edu;rmiller@energy.state.ca.us;rmm@cpuc.ca.gov;rmorillo@ci.burbank.ca.us;rob ert.pettinato@ladwp.com;Robert.Rozanski@ladwp.com;roger.montgomery@swgas.com;roger.pelote@wi lliams.com;rogerv@mid.org;ron.deaton@ladwp.com;rprince@semprautilities.com;rreinhard@mofo.com;rr taylor@srpnet.com;rsa@a-klaw.com;rschmidt@bartlewells.com;rsmutny-

jones@caiso.com;rwinthrop@pilotpowergroup.com;ryan.flynn@pacificorp.com;S1L7@pge.com;saeed.far rokhpay@ferc.gov;samuel.r.sadler@state.or.us;sandra.carolina@swgas.com;Sandra.ely@state.nm.us;sas@a-

klaw.com;sasteriadis@apx.com;sbeatty@cwclaw.com;sberlin@mccarthylaw.com;sbeserra@sbcglobal.ne t;scarter@nrdc.org;scohn@smud.org;scott.tomashefsky@ncpa.com;scottanders@sandiego.edu;scr@cpu c.ca.gov;sdhilton@stoel.com;sellis@fypower.org;sendo@ci.pasadena.ca.us;sephra.ninow@energycenter .org;sgm@cpuc.ca.gov;slins@ci.glendale.ca.us;sls@a-

klaw.com;smichel@westernresources.org;smindel@knowledgeinenergy.com;smk@cpuc.ca.gov;snewsom@semprautilities.com;spauker@wsgr.com;sscb@pge.com;ssmyers@att.net;steve.koerner@elpaso.co

m;steve@schiller.com;stevek@kromer.com;steven.huhman@morganstanley.com;steven.schleimer@bar clayscapital.com;steven@iepa.com;steven@lipmanconsulting.com;steven@moss.net;svn@cpuc.ca.gov;s vongdeuane@semprasolutions.com;svs6@pge.com;tam@cpuc.ca.gov;tburke@sfwater.org;tcarlson@reli ant.com;tcx@cpuc.ca.gov;tdarton@pilotpowergroup.com;tdillard@sierrapacific.com;THAMILTON5@CHA RTER.NET;thunt@cecmail.org;tiffany.rau@bp.com;tim.hemig@nrgenergy.com;todil@mckennalong.com; Tom.Elgie@powerex.com;tomb@crossborderenergy.com;tomk@mid.org;trdill@westernhubs.com;trobert s@sempra.com;UHelman@caiso.com;vb@pointcarbon.com;vitaly.lee@aes.com;vjw3@pge.com;vprabha karan@goodinmacbride.com;vwelch@environmentaldefense.org;wbooth@booth-law.com;westgas@aol.com;william.tomlinson@elpaso.com;wsm@cpuc.ca.gov;wtasat@arb.ca.gov;www @eslawfirm.com;wynne@braunlegal.com;ygross@sempraglobal.com;zaiontj@bp.com;

Downloaded December 3, 2007, last updated on November 30, 2007 Commissioner Assigned: Michael R. Peevey on April 17, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Charlotte TerKeurst on September 19, 2006; ALJ Assigned: Jonathan Lakritz on May 9, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Meg Gottstein on April 17, 2006

# CPUC DOCKET NO. R0604009 CPUC REV 11-30-07

Total number of addressees: 416

**CALIFORNIA ENERGY MARKETS** 

517-B POTRERO AVE SAN FRANCISCO CA 94110 Email: cem@newsdata.com Status: INFORMATION

**CALIFORNIA ISO** 

LEGAL AND REGULATORY DEPARTMENT 151 BLUE RAVINE ROAD FOLSOM CA 95630 Email: e-recipient@caiso.com

Status: INFORMATION

DAN ADLER DIRECTOR, TECH AND POLICY

**DEVELOPMENT** 

**CALIFORNIA CLEAN ENERGY FUND** 

5 THIRD ST, STE 1125 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94103 Email: Dan.adler@calcef.org Status: INFORMATION

FARROKH ALBUYEH VICE PRESIDENT

**OPEN ACCESS TECHNOLOGY INTERNATIONAL INC** 

SUITE 910

1875 SOUTH GRANT ST SAN MATEO CA 94402

Email: farrokh.albuyeh@oati.net

Status: INFORMATION

MAHLON ALDRIDGE **ECOLOGY ACTION** 

PO BOX 1188

SANTA CRUZ CA 95060 Email: emahlon@ecoact.org Status: INFORMATION

CATHIE ALLEN CA STATE MGR.

**PACIFICORP** 

825 NE MULTNOMAH ST, STE 2000

PORTLAND OR 97232

Email: californiadockets@pacificorp.com

Status: INFORMATION

SCOTT J. ANDERS RESEARCH/ADMINISTRATIVE

**DIRECTOR** 

UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO SCHOOL OF LAW

5998 ALCALA PARK SAN DIEGO CA 92110

Email: scottanders@sandiego.edu

Status: INFORMATION

MRW & ASSOCIATES, INC.

1814 FRANKLIN ST, STE 720

OAKLAND CA 94612 Email: mrw@mrwassoc.com

Status: INFORMATION

**CINDY ADAMS** 

**COVANTA ENERGY CORPORATION** 

**40 LANE ROAD** FAIRFIELD NJ 7004

FOR: Covanta Energy Corporation Email: cadams@covantaenergy.com

Status: PARTY

CASE ADMINISTRATION

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

2244 WALNUT GROVE AVE., RM. 370

ROSEMEAD CA 91770 Email: case.admin@sce.com Status: INFORMATION

MICHAEL P. ALCANTAR ATTORNEY

**ALCANTAR & KAHL, LLP** 

120 MONTGOMERY ST, STE 2200 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104

FOR: Cogeneration Association of California/Energy

**Producers and Users Coalition** 

Email: mpa@a-klaw.com

Status: PARTY

**KEN ALEX** PO BOX 944255 1300 I ST. STE 125

SACRAMENTO CA 94244-2550

FOR: People of the State of California

Email: ken.alex@doj.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

PETER V. ALLEN

THELEN REID BROWN RAYSMAN & STEINER

101 SECOND ST, STE 1800 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105 Email: pvallen@thelen.com Status: INFORMATION

PG&E

MAIL CODE B24A PO BOX 770000

**JASMIN ANSAR** 

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94177 Email: jxa2@pge.com Status: INFORMATION

Downloaded December 3, 2007, last updated on November 30, 2007 Commissioner Assigned: Michael R. Peevey on April 17, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Charlotte TerKeurst on September 19, 2006; ALJ Assigned: Jonathan Lakritz on May 9, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Meg Gottstein on April 17, 2006

#### CPUC DOCKET NO. R0604009 CPUC REV 11-30-07

Total number of addressees: 416

JEANNE B. ARMSTRONG ATTORNEY

**GOODIN MACBRIDE SQUERI DAY & LAMPREY** 

505 SANSOME ST, STE 900 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111 FOR: Wild Goose Storage LLC

Email: jarmstrong@goodinmacbride.com

Status: PARTY

SAKIS ASTERIADIS

**APX INC** 

1270 FIFTH AVE., STE 15R NEW YORK NY 10029 Email: sasteriadis@apx.com Status: INFORMATION

**GARY BARCH** 

FELLON-MCCORD & ASSOCIATES, INC.

**SUITE 2000** 

9960 CORPORATE CAMPUS DRIVE

LOUISVILLE KY 40223

Email: gbarch@knowledgeinenergy.com

Status: INFORMATION

AIMEE BARNES MANAGER REGULATORY AFFAIRS

ECOSECURITIES
206 W. BONITA AVE
CLAREMONT CA 91711

Email: aimee.barnes@ecosecurities.com

Status: INFORMATION

CURT BARRY
717 K ST, STE 503
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
Email: curt.barry@iwpnews.com

Status: INFORMATION

PANAMA BARTHOLOMY ADVISOR TO CHAIR

**PFANNENSTIEL** 

**CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION** 

1516 9TH ST

SACRAMENTO CA 95814

Email: pbarthol@energy.state.ca.us

Status: INFORMATION

R. THOMAS BEACH CROSSBORDER ENERGY 2560 NINTH ST, STE 213A BERKELEY CA 94710-2557

FOR: the California Cogeneration Council Email: tomb@crossborderenergy.com

Status: PARTY

JESUS ARREDONDO NRG ENERGY INC. 4600 CARLSBAD BLVD. CARLSBAD CA 99208

Email: jesus.arredondo@nrgenergy.com

Status: INFORMATION

**ELIZABETH BAKER** 

SUMMIT BLUE CONSULTING

1722 14TH ST, STE 230 BOULDER CO 80304

Email: bbaker@summitblue.com

Status: INFORMATION

BARBARA R. BARKOVICH BARKOVICH & YAP, INC. 44810 ROSEWOOD TERRACE MENDOCINO CA 95460

Email: brbarkovich@earthlink.net

Status: INFORMATION

KELLY BARR MANAGER, REGULATORY AFFAIRS &

CONTRACTS

SALT RIVER PROJECT PO BOX 52025, PAB 221 PHOENIX AZ 85072-2025

FOR: Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement and

Power District

Email: kelly.barr@srpnet.com

Status: PARTY

OBADIAH BARTHOLOMY MECHANICAL ENGINEER SACRAMENTO MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT

M.S. B257 6201 S. ST

SACRAMENTO CA 95817 Email: obartho@smud.org Status: INFORMATION

CARMEN E. BASKETTE CORPORATE DEVELOPMENT

PRINCIPAL **ENERNOC** 

594 HOWARD ST., STE 400 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105

FOR: EnerNoc, Inc.

Email: cbaskette@enernoc.com

Status: INFORMATION

SEAN P. BEATTY ATTORNEY COOPER, WHITE & COOPER, LLP 201 CALIFORNIA ST., 17TH FLR SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111

Email: sbeatty@cwclaw.com

Downloaded December 3, 2007, last updated on November 30, 2007 Commissioner Assigned: Michael R. Peevey on April 17, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Charlotte TerKeurst on September 19, 2006; ALJ Assigned: Jonathan Lakritz on May 9, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Meg Gottstein on April 17, 2006

#### CPUC DOCKET NO. R0604009 CPUC REV 11-30-07

Total number of addressees: 416

**BUD BEEBE** 

SACRAMENTO MUNICIPAL UTIL DIST

MS B257 6201 S ST

SACRAMENTO CA 95817-1899 Email: bbeebe@smud.org Status: INFORMATION

RYAN BERNARDO

**BRAUN & BLAISING, P.C.** 

915 L ST, STE 1270 SACRAMENTO CA 95814

Email: bernardo@braunlegal.com

Status: INFORMATION

SARAH BESERRA

**CALIFORNIA REPORTS** 

39 CASTLE HILL COURT VALLEJO CA 94591

FOR: California Reports Email: sbeserra@sbcglobal.net

Status: INFORMATION

CHARLIE BLAIR

**DELTA ENERGY & ENVIRONMENT** 

15 GREAT STUART ST

EDINBURGH UK EH2 7TP UNITED KINGDOM

Email: charlie.blair@delta-ee.com

Status: INFORMATION

**GREG BLUE** 

**ENXCO DEVELOPMENT CORP** 

5000 EXECUTIVE PARKWAY, STE.140

SAN RAMON CA 94583 Email: gblue@enxco.com Status: INFORMATION

WILLIAM H. BOOTH ATTORNEY

LAW OFFICES OF WILLIAM H. BOOTH

1500 NEWELL AVE, 5TH FLR WALNUT CREEK CA 94596

FOR: California Large Energy Consumers Association

Email: wbooth@booth-law.com

Status: PARTY

KYLE D. BOUDREAUX

**FPL GROUP** 

700 UNIVERSE BLVD., JES/JB JUNO BEACH FL 33408

FOR: FPL Energy Project Management

Email: kyle\_boudreaux@fpl.com

Status: PARTY

C. SUSIE BERLIN ATTORNEY

MC CARTHY & BERLIN, LLP

100 PARK CENTER PLAZA, STE 501

SAN JOSE CA 95113

FOR: Northern California Power Agency

Email: sberlin@mccarthylaw.com

Status: PARTY

**CLARK BERNIER** 

**RLW ANALYTICS** 

1055 BROADWAY, STE G SONOMA CA 95476

Email: clark.bernier@rlw.com Status: INFORMATION

CLARENCE BINNINGER DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL

**DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE** 

455 GOLDEN GATE AVE, STE 11000

SAN FRANICSCO CA 94102

Email: clarence.binninger@doj.ca.gov

Status: STATE-SERVICE

B. B. BLEVINS EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

**CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION** 

1516 9TH ST, MS-39

SACRAMENTO CA 95814

FOR: California Energy Commission

Email: bblevins@energy.state.ca.us

Status: STATE-SERVICE

ASHLEE M. BONDS

THELEN REID BROWN RAYSMAN&STEINER LLP

SUITE 1800

101 SECOND ST

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105

Email: abonds@thelen.com Status: INFORMATION

**KEVIN BOUDREAUX** 

**CALPINE POWER AMERICA-CA, LLC** 

717 TEXAS AVE, STE 1000

**HOUSTON TX 77002** 

FOR: Calpine Power America

Email: kevin.boudreaux@calpine.com

Status: PARTY

KAREN BOWEN ATTORNEY

**WINSTON & STRAWN LLP** 

101 CALIFORNIA ST

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111

FOR: Mirant California, LLCMirant Delta, LLC, and Mirant

Potrero, LLC

Email: kbowen@winston.com

Downloaded December 3, 2007, last updated on November 30, 2007 Commissioner Assigned: Michael R. Peevey on April 17, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Charlotte TerKeurst on September 19, 2006; ALJ Assigned: Jonathan Lakritz on May 9, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Meg Gottstein on April 17, 2006

#### CPUC DOCKET NO. R0604009 CPUC REV 11-30-07

Total number of addressees: 416

BIANCA BOWMAN RATE CASE COORDINATOR PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

PG&E MAIL CODE B9A PO BOX 770000

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94177

FOR: PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

Email: BRBc@pge.com Status: INFORMATION

DAVID BRANCHCOMB

**BRANCHCOMB ASSOCIATES, LLC** 

9360 OAKTREE LANE ORANGEVILLE CA 95662 Email: david@branchcomb.com Status: INFORMATION

CLARE BREIDENICH 224 1/2 24TH AVE EAST SEATTLE WA 98112

Email: cbreidenich@yahoo.com

Status: INFORMATION

**GLORIA BRITTON** 

ANZA ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.

58470 HWY 371 PO BOX 391909 ANZA CA 92539

FOR: Anza Electric Cooperative Inc. Email: GloriaB@anzaelectric.org

Status: PARTY

DONALD BROOKHYSER ATTORNEY

**ALCANTAR & KAHL** 120 MONTGOMERY ST SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104

FOR: Energy Producers and Users Coalition

Email: rsa@a-klaw.com

Status: PARTY

ANDREW BROWN ATTORNEY **ELLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS, LLP** 

2015 H ST

SACRAMENTO CA 95811

FOR: Constellation New Energy, Inc., Constellation Energy

Commodities Group, Inc.Constellation Genration

Email: abb@eslawfirm.com

Status: PARTY

JACK BURKE LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS MANAGER **CALIFORNIA CENTER FOR SUSTAINABLE ENERGY** 

8690 BALBOA AVE., STE 100 SAN DIEGO CA 92123

Email: jack.burke@energycenter.org

Status: INFORMATION

ANDREW BRADFORD SENIOR MARKET RESEARCH

FELLON-MCCORD & ASSOCIATES

**SUITE 2000** 

9960 CORPORATE CAMPUS DRIVE

LOUISVILLE KY 40223

Email: andrew.bradford@constellation.com

Status: INFORMATION

DOWNEY BRAND **DOWNEY BRAND** 

555 CAPITOL MALL, 10TH FLR SACRAMENTO CA 95814-4686 FOR: Sacramento Municipal

Status: PARTY

ADAM BRIONES

THE GREENLINING INSTITUTE 1918 UNIVERSITY AVE. 2ND FLR

BERKELEY CA 94704

Email: adamb@greenlining.org Status: INFORMATION

DONALD BROOKHYSER **ALCANTAR & KAHL** 

1300 SW FIFTH AVE., STE 1750

PORTLAND OR 97210

FOR: Cogeneration Association of California

Email: deb@a-klaw.com

Status: PARTY

DOUGLAS BROOKS NEVADA POWER COMPANY

SIERRA PACIFIC POWER COMPANY

6226 WEST SAHARA AVE LAS VEGAS NV 89151 Email: dbrooks@nevp.com Status: INFORMATION

**VERONIQUE BUGNION** 

**POINT CARBON** 

205 SEVERN RIVER RD SEVERNA PARK MD 21146 Email: vb@pointcarbon.com

Status: INFORMATION

THERESA BURKE REGULATORY ANALYSTI

**SAN FRANCISCO PUC** 1155 MARKET ST, 4TH FLR SAN FRANCISO CA 94103 Email: tburke@sfwater.org

Downloaded December 3, 2007, last updated on November 30, 2007 Commissioner Assigned: Michael R. Peevey on April 17, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Charlotte TerKeurst on September 19, 2006; ALJ Assigned: Jonathan Lakritz on May 9, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Meg Gottstein on April 17, 2006

#### CPUC DOCKET NO. R0604009 CPUC REV 11-30-07

Total number of addressees: 416

PAM BURMICH

**AIR RESOURCES BOAD** 

1001 I ST, BOX 2815 SACRAMENTO CA 95812 Email: pburmich@arb.ca.gov

Status: STATE-SERVICE

JOSHUA BUSHINSKY WESTERN POLICY COORDINATOR

PEW CENTER ON GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE

2101 WILSON BLVD., STE 550 ARLINGTON VA 95816

Email: bushinskyj@pewclimate.org

Status: INFORMATION

Eugene Cadenasso

**CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION** 

RATEMAKING BRANCH 505 VAN NESS AVE AREA 4-A SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: cpe@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

TRENT A. CARLSON **RELIANT ENERGY** 

1000 MAIN ST

HOUSTON TX 77001 Email: tcarlson@reliant.com

Status: INFORMATION

IAN CARTER POLICY COORDINATOR-NORTH AMERICA

INTERNATIONAL EMISSIONS TRADING ASSN.

350 SPARKS ST, STE. 809

OTTAWA ON K1R 7S8 CANADA

FOR: International Emissions Trading Association

Email: carter@ieta.org

Status: PARTY

PHIL CARVER

**OREGON DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY** 

625 MARION ST., NE SALEM OR 97301-3737

Email: Philip.H.Carver@state.or.us

Status: INFORMATION

AUDREY CHANG STAFF SCIENTIST

NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL

111 SUTTER ST, 20TH FLR SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104 Email: achang@nrdc.org

Status: PARTY

**DALLAS BURTRAW** 1616 P ST, NW

WASHINGTON DC 20036 Email: burtraw@rff.org Status: INFORMATION

OLOF BYSTROM DIRECTOR, WESTERN ENERGY **CAMBRIDGE ENERGY RESEARCH ASSOCIATES** 

555 CALIFORNIA ST, 3RD FLR

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104 Email: obystrom@cera.com Status: INFORMATION

Andrew Campbell

**CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION** 

**EXECUTIVE DIVISION** 505 VAN NESS AVE RM 5203 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: aqc@cpuc.ca.qov Status: STATE-SERVICE

SANDRA CAROLINA

**SOUTHWEST GAS CORPORATION** 

PO BOX 98510

LAS VEGAS NV 89193-8510

Email: sandra.carolina@swgas.com

Status: INFORMATION

SHERYL CARTER

NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL

111 SUTTER ST, 20TH FLR SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104 Email: scarter@nrdc.org Status: INFORMATION

JENNIFER CHAMBERLIN STRATEGIC ENERGY, LLC

2633 WELLINGTON CT. CLYDE CA 94520

FOR: Strategic Energy, LLC

Email: jchamberlin@strategicenergy.com

Status: PARTY

**CLIFF CHEN** 

**UNION OF CONCERNED SCIENTIST** 

2397 SHATTUCK AVE, STE 203

BERKELEY CA 94704

FOR: Union of Concerned Scientists

Email: cchen@ucsusa.org

Downloaded December 3, 2007, last updated on November 30, 2007 Commissioner Assigned: Michael R. Peevey on April 17, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Charlotte TerKeurst on September 19, 2006; ALJ Assigned: Jonathan Lakritz on May 9, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Meg Gottstein on April 17, 2006

# **CPUC DOCKET NO. R0604009 CPUC REV 11-30-07**

Total number of addressees: 416

WILLIAM H. CHEN DIRECTOR, ENERGY POLICY WEST

REGION

CONSTELLATION NEW ENERGY, INC.

SPEAR TOWER, 36TH FLOOR

ONE MARKET ST

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105

Email: bill.chen@constellation.com

Status: PARTY

**ED CHIANG** 

**ELEMENT MARKETS, LLC** 

ONE SUGAR CREEK CENTER BLVD., STE 250

SUGAR LAND TX 77478

Email: echiang@elementmarkets.com

Status: INFORMATION

STEVEN M. COHN ASSISTANT GENERAL COUNSEL

SACRAMENTO MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT

PO BOX 15830

SACRAMENTO CA 95852-1830

FOR: Sacramento Municipal Utility District

Email: scohn@smud.org

Status: PARTY

ALAN COMNES

**WEST COAST POWER** 

3934 SE ASH ST PORTLAND OR 97214

Email: alan.comnes@nrgenergy.com

Status: INFORMATION

RICHARD COWART

**REGULATORY ASSISTANCE PROJECT** 

50 STATE ST, STE 3 MONTPELIER VT 5602

Email: rapcowart@aol.com Status: INFORMATION

HOLLY B. CRONIN STATE WATER PROJECT

**OPERATIONS DIV** 

**CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES** 

3310 EL CAMINO AVE., LL-90 SACRAMENTO CA 95821

Email: hcronin@water.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

RAYMOND J. CZAHAR, C.P.A. CHIEF FINANCIAL

**OFFICER** 

**WEST COAST GAS COMPANY** 

9203 BEATTY DRIVE SACRAMENTO CA 95826 Email: westgas@aol.com

Status: PARTY

BRIAN K. CHERRY DIRECTOR REGULATORY

**RELATIONS** 

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

77 BEALE ST, B10C

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94106

FOR: Pacific Gas and Electric Company

Email: bkc7@pge.com

Status: PARTY

Theresa Cho

**CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION** 

EXECUTIVE DIVISION 505 VAN NESS AVE RM 5207 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: tcx@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

KENNETH A. COLBURN

SYMBILTIC STRATEGIES, LLC

26 WINTON ROAD MEREDITH NH 3253

Email: kcolburn@symbioticstrategies.com

Status: INFORMATION

LISA A. COTTLE ATTORNEY

**WINSTON & STRAWN LLP** 

101 CALIFORNIA ST, 39TH FLR SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111

FOR: Mirant California, LLC, Mirant Delta, LLC, and Mirant

Potrero, LLC

Email: Icottle@winston.com

Status: PARTY

BRIAN T. CRAGG ATTORNEY

GOODIN, MACBRIDE, SQUERI, RITCHIE & DAY

505 SANSOME ST, STE 900 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111

FOR: Independent Energy Producers Association

Email: bcragg@goodinmacbride.com

Status: PARTY

SEBASTIEN CSAPO PROJECT MANAGER

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

MAIL CODE B9A PO BOX 770000

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94177 Email: sscb@pge.com Status: INFORMATION

KARLA DAILEY

CITY OF PALO ALTO UTILITIES DEPARTMENT

BOX 10250

PALO ALTO CA 94303

Email: karla.dailey@cityofpaloalto.org

Downloaded December 3, 2007, last updated on November 30, 2007 Commissioner Assigned: Michael R. Peevey on April 17, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Charlotte TerKeurst on September 19, 2006; ALJ Assigned: Jonathan Lakritz on May 9, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Meg Gottstein on April 17, 2006

# **CPUC DOCKET NO. R0604009 CPUC REV 11-30-07**

Total number of addressees: 416

THOMAS DARTON PILOT POWER GROUP, INC.

SUITE 520

8910 UNIVERSITY CENTER LANE

SAN DIEGO CA 92122 FOR: Pilot Power Group

Email: tdarton@pilotpowergroup.com

Status: PARTY

Matthew Deal

**CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION** 

EXECUTIVE DIVISION 505 VAN NESS AVE RM 5215 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: mjd@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

LISA DECARLO STAFF COUNSEL CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION

1516 9TH ST MS-14 SACRAMENTO CA 95814

Email: Idecarlo@energy.state.ca.us

Status: STATE-SERVICE

RALPH E. DENNIS DIRECTOR, REGULATORY AFFAIRS

**FELLON-MCCORD & ASSOCIATES** 

CONSTELLATION NEWENERGY-GAS DIVISION 9960 CORPORATE CAMPUS DRIVE, STE 2000

LOUISVILLE KY 40223

Email: ralph.dennis@constellation.com

Status: INFORMATION

BALDASSARO DI CAPO 151 BLUE RAVINE ROAD FOLSOM CA 95630

FOR: California Independent System Operator

Email: bdicapo@caiso.com Status: STATE-SERVICE

THOMAS DILL PRESIDENT LODI GAS STORAGE, L.L.C. 1021 MAIN ST STE 1500

HOUSTON TX 77002-6509 Email: trdill@westernhubs.com

Status: PARTY

JEFFREY DOLL

**CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD** 

PO BOX 2815 1001 I ST SACRAMENTO CA 95812 Email: jdoll@arb.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE KYLE L. DAVIS
PACIFICORP

825 NE MULTNOMAH ST., STE 2000

PORTLAND OR 97232 FOR: PacifiCorp

Email: kyle.l.davis@pacificorp.com

Status: PARTY

RONALD F. DEATON

LOS ANGELES DEPARTMENT OF WATER & POWER

111 NORTH HOPE ST, RM 1550 LOS ANGELES CA 90012

FOR: Los Angeles Department of Water and Power

Email: ron.deaton@ladwp.com

Status: PARTY

PAUL DELANEY

**AMERICAN UTILITY NETWORK (A.U.N.)** 

10705 DEER CANYON DRIVE

ALTA LOMA CA 91737

FOR: American Utility Network Email: pssed@adelphia.net

Status: PARTY

LEONARD DEVANNA EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT

CLEAN ENERGY SYSTEMS, INC. 11330 SUNCO DRIVE, STE A RANCHO CORDOVA CA 95742 FOR: Clean Energy Systems, Inc.

Email: Irdevanna-rf@cleanenergysystems.com

Status: PARTY

WILLIAM F. DIETRICH ATTORNEY

**DIETRICH LAW** 

2977 YGNACIO VALLEY ROAD, 613 WALNUT CREEK CA 94598-3535 Email: dietrichlaw2@earthlink.net

Status: INFORMATION

TREVOR DILLARD

SIERRA PACIFIC POWER COMPANY

PO BOX 10100

6100 NEIL ROAD, MS S4A50

**RENO NV 89520** 

Email: tdillard@sierrapacific.com

Status: INFORMATION

DANIEL W. DOUGLASS ATTORNEY

DOUGLASS & LIDDELL 21700 OXNARD ST, STE 1030 WOODLAND HILLS CA 91367

FOR: Western Power Trading Forum Email: douglass@energyattorney.com

Downloaded December 3, 2007, last updated on November 30, 2007 Commissioner Assigned: Michael R. Peevey on April 17, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Charlotte TerKeurst on September 19, 2006; ALJ Assigned: Jonathan Lakritz on May 9, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Meg Gottstein on April 17, 2006

#### CPUC DOCKET NO. R0604009 CPUC REV 11-30-07

Total number of addressees: 416

JASON DUBCHAK ASSOCIATE GENERAL COUNSEL

WILD GOOSE STORAGE LLC

C/O NISKA GAS STORAGE, SUITE 400

607 8TH AVE S.W.

CALGARY AB T2P OA7 CANADA FOR: Wild Goose Storage LLC Email: jason.dubchak@niskags.com

Status: PARTY

PIERRE H. DUVAIR

**CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION** 

1516 NINTH ST, MS-41 SACRAMENTO CA 95814

Email: pduvair@energy.state.ca.us

Status: STATE-SERVICE

KAREN EDSON

151 BLUE RAVINE ROAD FOLSOM CA 95630 Status: INFORMATION

THOMAS ELGIE

**POWEREX CORPORATION** 

1400, 666 BURRAND ST

VANCOUVER BC V6C 2X8 CANADA

Email: Tom.Elgie@powerex.com

Status: INFORMATION

SANDRA ELY

**NEW MEXICO ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT** 

1190 ST FRANCIS DRIVE SANTA FE NM 87501

Email: Sandra.ely@state.nm.us

Status: INFORMATION

STEVE ENDO

PASADENA DEPARTMENT OF WATER & POWER

45 EAST GLENARM ST PASADENA CA 91105

Email: sendo@ci.pasadena.ca.us

Status: INFORMATION

DIANE I. FELLMAN DIRECTOR, REGULATORY AFFAIRS

FPL ENERGY PROJECT MANAGEMENT, INC.

234 VAN NESS AVE

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102

FOR: FPL Energy Project Management Inc

Email: diane\_fellman@fpl.com Status: INFORMATION KIRBY DUSEL

NAVIGANT CONSULTING, INC.

3100 ZINFANDEL DRIVE, STE 600 RANCHO CORDOVA CA 95670

Email: kdusel@navigantconsulting.com

Status: INFORMATION

HARVEY EDER

**PUBLIC SOLAR POWER COALITION** 

1218 12TH ST., 25

SANTA MONICA CA 90401

Email: harveyederpspc.org@hotmail.com

Status: INFORMATION

DENNIS M.P. EHLING ATTORNEY

KIRKPATRICK & LOCKHART NICHOLSON GRAHAM

10100 SANTA MONICA BLVD., 7TH FLR

LOS ANGELES CA 90067 FOR: City of Vernon Email: dehling@klng.com

Status: PARTY

SHAUN ELLIS 2183 UNION ST

2103 UNION 51

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94123 Email: sellis@fypower.org Status: INFORMATION

NADAV ENBAR

**ENERGY INSIGHTS** 

1750 14TH ST, STE 200 BOULDER CO 80302

Email: nenbar@energy-insights.com

Status: INFORMATION

SAEED FARROKHPAY

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

110 BLUE RAVINE RD., STE 107

FOLSOM CA 95630

Email: saeed.farrokhpay@ferc.gov

Status: INFORMATION

Julie A. Fitch

**CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION** 

DIVISION OF STRATEGIC PLANNING

505 VAN NESS AVE RM 5119 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: jf2@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

Downloaded December 3, 2007, last updated on November 30, 2007 Commissioner Assigned: Michael R. Peevey on April 17, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Charlotte TerKeurst on September 19, 2006; ALJ Assigned: Jonathan Lakritz on May 9, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Meg Gottstein on April 17, 2006

#### CPUC DOCKET NO. R0604009 CPUC REV 11-30-07

Total number of addressees: 416

MICHEL FLORIO ATTORNEYS AT LAW 711 VAN NESS AVE., STE. 350 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102 Email: mflorio@turn.org

Status: INFORMATION

Cathleen A. Fogel

**CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION** 

**ENERGY RESOURCES BRANCH** 505 VAN NESS AVE AREA 4-A SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: cf1@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

ORLANDO B. FOOTE, III ATTORNEY HORTON, KNOX, CARTER & FOOTE

895 BROADWAY, STE 101 EL CENTRO CA 92243 Email: ofoote@hkcf-law.com Status: INFORMATION

JONATHAN FORRESTER

PG&E

MAIL CODE N13C PO BOX 770000

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94177 Email: JDF1@PGE.COM Status: INFORMATION

NORMAN J. FURUTA ATTORNEY **FEDERAL EXECUTIVE AGENCIES** 

1455 MARKET ST., STE 1744 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94103-1399 Email: norman.furuta@navv.mil Status: INFORMATION

LAURA I. GENAO ATTORNEY **SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON** 

**PO BOX 800** 2244 WALNUT GROVE AVE ROSEMEAD CA 91770

Email: Laura.Genao@sce.com

Status: PARTY

JULIE GILL EXTERNAL AFFAIRS MANAGER

**CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR** 151 BLUE RAVINE ROAD

FOLSOM CA 95630 FOR: CAISO Email: jgill@caiso.com

Status: STATE-SERVICE

PORTLAND OR 97232

Email: ryan.flynn@pacificorp.com

825 NE MULTNOMAH ST, 18TH FLR

Status: PARTY

RYAN FLYNN

**PACIFICORP** 

CYNTHIA A. FONNER SENIOR COUNSEL **CONSTELLATION ENERGY GROUP INC** 

550 W. WASHINGTON ST, STE 300

CHICAGO IL 60661

FOR: Constellation Energy Group Inc Email: Cynthia.A.Fonner@constellation.com

Status: PARTY

Jamie Fordyce

CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION DIVISION OF STRATEGIC PLANNING 505 VAN NESS AVE AREA 5-B SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: jbf@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

**KEVIN FOX** 

**WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI** 

ONE MARKET ST, SPEAR TOWER, 3300 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105

Email: kfox@wsgr.com Status: INFORMATION

MICHELLE GARCIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD

1001 I ST

SACRAMENTO CA 95814 Email: mgarcia@arb.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

FIJI GEORGE

**EL PASO CORPORATION** 

**EL PASO BUILDING** PO BOX 2511 **HOUSTON TX 77252** 

Email: fiji.george@elpaso.com Status: INFORMATION

Anne Gillette

**CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION** 

**ENERGY RESOURCES BRANCH** 505 VAN NESS AVE AREA 4-A SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: aeg@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

Downloaded December 3, 2007, last updated on November 30, 2007 Commissioner Assigned: Michael R. Peevey on April 17, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Charlotte TerKeurst on September 19, 2006; ALJ Assigned: Jonathan Lakritz on May 9, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Meg Gottstein on April 17, 2006

#### CPUC DOCKET NO. R0604009 CPUC REV 11-30-07

Total number of addressees: 416

ANNETTE GILLIAM ATTORNEY

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY** 

2244 WALNUT GROVE AVE ROSEMEAD CA 91770

FOR: Southern California Edison Email: annette.gilliam@sce.com

Status: PARTY

HAYLEY GOODSON ATTORNEY
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK
711 VAN NESS AVE, STE 350

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102 Email: hayley@turn.org Status: INFORMATION

JEFFREY P. GRAY

DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE, LLP 505 MONTGOMERY ST, STE 800 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-6533

FOR: Calpine Corporation Email: jeffgray@dwt.com

Status: PARTY

Jacqueline Greig

**CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION** 

ENERGY COST OF SERVICE & NATURAL GAS BRANCH

505 VAN NESS AVE RM 4102 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214 Email: jnm@cpuc.ca.gov

Status: STATE-SERVICE

KAREN GRIFFIN EXECUTIVE OFFICE CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMINISSION

1516 9TH ST, MS 39 SACRAMENTO CA 95814

Email: kgriffin@energy.state.ca.us

Status: STATE-SERVICE

YVONNE GROSS REGULATORY POLICY MANAGER

**SEMPRA ENERGY** 

HQ08C 101 ASH ST

SAN DIEGO CA 92103

Email: ygross@sempraglobal.com

Status: INFORMATION

ELIZABETH W. HADLEY CITY OF REDDING 777 CYPRESS AVE REDDING CA 96001

Email: ehadley@reupower.com

Status: INFORMATION

HOWARD V. GOLUB
NIXON PEABODY LLP

2 EMBARCADERO CENTER, STE. 2700

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111

Email: hgolub@nixonpeabody.com

Status: INFORMATION

KASSANDRA GOUGH

**CALPINE CORPORATION** 

1127 11TH ST, STE 242 SACRAMENTO CA 95814 FOR: Calpine Corporation Email: kgough@calpine.com

Status: INFORMATION

JOSEPH GRECO VICE PRESIDENT - WESTERN REGION

**CAITHNESS ENERGY, LLC.** 

9590 PROTOTYPE COURT, STE 200

**RENO NV 89521** 

Email: jgreco@caithnessenergy.com

Status: INFORMATION

KRISTIN GRENFELL PROJECT ATTORNEY, CALIF.

**ENERGY PROGRAM** 

NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL

111 SUTTER ST, 20TH FLR SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104 Email: kgrenfell@nrdc.org

Status: PARTY

ANN G. GRIMALDI

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

101 CALIFORNIA ST, 41ST FLR SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111

FOR: Center for Energy and Economic Development

Email: agrimaldi@mckennalong.com

Status: PARTY

ELSTON K. GRUBAUGH

IMPERIAL IRRIGATION DISTRICT

333 EAST BARIONI BLVD.
IMPERIAL CA 92251
Email: ekgrubaugh@iid.com
Status: INFORMATION

JEFFREY L. HAHN

**COVANTA ENERGY CORPORATION** 

876 MT. VIEW DRIVE LAFAYETTE CA 94549

Email: jhahn@covantaenergy.com

Downloaded December 3, 2007, last updated on November 30, 2007 Commissioner Assigned: Michael R. Peevey on April 17, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Charlotte TerKeurst on September 19, 2006; ALJ Assigned: Jonathan Lakritz on May 9, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Meg Gottstein on April 17, 2006

# **CPUC DOCKET NO. R0604009 CPUC REV 11-30-07**

Total number of addressees: 416

TOM HAMILTON MANAGING PARTNER ENERGY CONCIERGE SERVICES

321 MESA LILA RD GLENDALE CA 91208

Email: THAMILTON5@CHARTER.NET

Status: INFORMATION

ANDREW L. HARRIS

PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY PO BOX 770000 MAIL CODE B9A SAN FRANCISCO CA 94177

Email: alho@pge.com Status: PARTY

JEFFERY D. HARRIS ATTORNEY **ELLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS LLP** 

2015 H ST

SACRAMENTO CA 95814

FOR: LS Power Generation, LLC Email: jdh@eslawfirm.com

Status: PARTY

AUDRA HARTMANN **DYNEGY INC.** 

980 NINTH ST, STE 1420 SACRAMENTO CA 95814

Email: Audra.Hartmann@Dynegy.com

Status: INFORMATION

LYNN HAUG

**ELLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS, LLP** 

2015 H ST

SACRAMENTO CA 95816 Email: Imh@eslawfirm.com Status: INFORMATION

DAN HECHT SEMPRA ENERGY 101 ASH ST

SAN DIEGO CA 92101

Email: dhecht@sempratrading.com

Status: PARTY

**UDI HELMAN** 

**CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYS. OPER. CORP** 

151 BLUE RAVINE ROAD FOLSOM CA 95630

FOR: California Independent System Operator Corporation

Email: UHelman@caiso.com

Status: PARTY

PETER W. HANSCHEN ATTORNEY MORRISON & FOERSTER, LLP 101 YGNACIO VALLEY ROAD, STE 450

WALNUT CREEK CA 94596 Email: phanschen@mofo.com Status: INFORMATION

**ARNO HARRIS** 

RECURRENT ENERGY, INC. 220 HALLECK ST., STE 220 SAN FRANCISCSO CA 94129 Email: arno@recurrentenergy.com

Status: INFORMATION

ANITA HART SENIOR SPECIALIST/STATE

REGULATORYAFFAIR

**SOUTHWEST GAS CORPORATION** 5241 SPRING MOUNTAIN ROAD

LAS VEGAS NV 89193

Email: anita.hart@swgas.com Status: INFORMATION

KERRY HATTEVIK

MIRANT CORPORATION

696 WEST 10TH ST PITTSBURG CA 94565 FOR: Mirant Corporation Email: kerry.hattevik@mirant.com

Status: PARTY

MARCEL HAWIGER

THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK

711 VAN NESS AVE, STE 350 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102 Email: marcel@turn.org Status: PARTY

RICHARD HELGESON

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA PUBLIC POWER AUTHORI

225 S. LAKE AVE., STE 1250 PASADENA CA 91101

FOR: Southern California Public Power Authority

Email: rhelgeson@scppa.org

Status: PARTY

**TIM HEMIG** 

NRG ENERGY, INC.

1819 ASTON AVE, STE 105 CARLSBAD CA 92008

Email: tim.hemig@nrgenergy.com

Downloaded December 3, 2007, last updated on November 30, 2007 Commissioner Assigned: Michael R. Peevey on April 17, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Charlotte TerKeurst on September 19, 2006; ALJ Assigned: Jonathan Lakritz on May 9, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Meg Gottstein on April 17, 2006

#### CPUC DOCKET NO. R0604009 CPUC REV 11-30-07

Total number of addressees: 416

JOSEPH HENRI 31 MIRAMONTE ROAD WALNUT CREEK CA 94597 Email: josephhenri@hotmail.com

Status: INFORMATION

SETH HILTON ATTORNEY STOEL RIVES

111 SUTTER ST., STE 700 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104 FOR: El Paso Natural Gas Email: sdhilton@stoel.com Status: INFORMATION

ALDYN HOEKSTRA

PACE GLOBAL ENERGY SERVICES 420 WEST BROADWAY, 4TH FLR SAN DIEGO CA 92101

Email: aldyn.hoekstra@paceglobal.com

Status: INFORMATION

LAURIE TEN HOPE ADVISOR TO COMMISSIONER

**BYRON** 

**CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION** 

1516 9TH ST, MS-32

SACRAMENTO CA 95814-5512 Email: Itenhope@energy.state.ca.us

Status: INFORMATION

RANDY S. HOWARD

LOS ANGELES DEPT. OF WATER AND POWER

111 NORTH HOPE ST, RM 921 LOS ANGELES CA 90012 Email: randy.howard@ladwp.com

Status: INFORMATION

JOHN P. HUGHES MANAGER, REGULATORY AFFAIRS

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

601 VAN NESS AVE, STE. 2040 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102 Email: john.hughes@sce.com

Status: PARTY

**RAYMOND HUNG** 

PG&E

PO BOX 770000 MAIL CODE B9A SAN FRANCISCO CA 94177 Email: RHHJ@pge.com

Status: INFORMATION

CHRISTOPHER A. HILEN ASSISTANT GENERAL

COUNSEL

SIERRA PACIFIC POWER COMPANY

6100 NEIL ROAD RENO NV 89511 Email: chilen@son

Email: chilen@sppc.com Status: INFORMATION

**GARY HINNERS** 

RELIANT ENERGY, INC.

**PO BOX 148** 

HOUSTON TX 77001-0148 Email: ghinners@reliant.com Status: INFORMATION

J. ANDREW HOERNER

**REDEFINING PROGRESS** 

1904 FRANKLIN ST OAKLAND CA 94612

Email: hoerner@redefiningprogress.org

Status: PARTY

GEORGE HOPLEY

**BARCLAYS CAPITAL** 

200 PARK AVE

NEW YORK NY 10166

Email: george.hopley@barcap.com

Status: INFORMATION

DAVID L. HUARD ATTORNEY

MANATT, PHELPS & PHILLIPS, LLP 11355 WEST OLYMPIC BLVD

LOS ANGELES CA 90064

FOR: Los Angeles County/Trans Canada Pipelines

Email: dhuard@manatt.com

Status: PARTY

STEVEN HUHMAN

MORGAN STANLEY CAPITAL GROUP INC.

2000 WESTCHESTER AVE PURCHASE NY 10577

Email: steven.huhman@morganstanley.com

Status: PARTY

TAMLYN M. HUNT ENERGY PROGRAM DIRECTOR

**COMMUNITY ENVIRONMENTAL COUNCIL** 

26 W. ANAPAMU ST., 2ND FLR SANTA BARBARA CA 93101

FOR: Community Environmental Council

Email: thunt@cecmail.org

Downloaded December 3, 2007, last updated on November 30, 2007 Commissioner Assigned: Michael R. Peevey on April 17, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Charlotte TerKeurst on September 19, 2006; ALJ Assigned: Jonathan Lakritz on May 9, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Meg Gottstein on April 17, 2006

# **CPUC DOCKET NO. R0604009 CPUC REV 11-30-07**

Total number of addressees: 416

CAROL J. HURLOCK

**CALIFORNIA DEPT. OF WATER RESOURCES** 

JOINT OPERATIONS CENTER 3310 EL CAMINO AVE. RM 300 SACRAMENTO CA 95821 Email: hurlock@water.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

Judith Ikle

**CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION** 

ENERGY RESOURCES BRANCH 505 VAN NESS AVE RM 4012 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214 FOR: Energy Resources Branch

Email: jci@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

PETER JAZAYERI

STROOCK & STROOCK & LAVAN LLP

2029 CENTURY PARK EAST, STE 1800

LOS ANGELES CA 90067 Email: pjazayeri@stroock.com Status: INFORMATION

JOHN JENSEN PRESIDENT **MOUNTAIN UTILITIES** 

PO BOX 205

KIRKWOOD CA 95646 FOR: Mountain Utilities Email: jjensen@kirkwood.com

Status: PARTY

LEILANI JOHNSON KOWAL

LOS ANGELES DEPT. OF WATER AND POWER

111 N. HOPE ST, RM 1050 LOS ANGELES CA 90012

Email: leilani.johnson@ladwp.com

Status: INFORMATION

MARC D. JOSEPH

**ADAMS BRADWELL JOSEPH & CARDOZO** 

601 GATEWAY BLVD. STE 1000 SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO CA 94080

FOR: California Unions for Reliable Energy&Coalition of

California Utility Employees
Email: mdioseph@adamsbroadwell.com

Status: INFORMATION

Sara M. Kamins

**CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION** 

ENERGY RESOURCES BRANCH 505 VAN NESS AVE AREA 4-A SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: smk@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

MICHAEL A. HYAMS POWER ENTERPRISE-

**REGULATORY AFFAIRS** 

SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMM

1155 MARKET ST., 4TH FLR SAN FRANCISCO CA 94103 Email: mhyams@sfwater.org Status: INFORMATION

AKBAR JAZAYEIRI DIRECTOR OF REVENUE &

**TARRIFFS** 

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY** 

2244 WALNUT GROVE AVE. RM 390

ROSEMEAD CA 91770

FOR: Southern California Edison Company

Email: akbar.jazayeri@sce.com

Status: PARTY

**BRUNO JEIDER** 

**BURBANK WATER & POWER** 

164 WEST MAGNOLIA BLVD.

BURBANK CA 91502

Email: bjeider@ci.burbank.ca.us

Status: INFORMATION

KENNETH C. JOHNSON

KENNETH CARLISLE JOHNSON

2502 ROBERTSON RD SANTA CLARA CA 95051

FOR: Kenneth Carlisle Johnson Email: kjinnovation@earthlink.net

Status: PARTY

BRIAN M. JONES

M. J. BRADLEY & ASSOCIATES, INC.

47 JUNCTION SQUARE DRIVE

CONCORD MA 1742

Email: bjones@mjbradley.com Status: INFORMATION

EVELYN KAHL ATTORNEY ALCANTAR & KAHL, LLP

120 MONTGOMERY ST, STE 2200 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104

FOR: Energy Producers & Users Coalition

Email: ek@a-klaw.com

Status: PARTY

CATHY A. KARLSTAD

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

2244 WALNUT GROVE AVE. ROSEMEAD CA 91770

FOR: Southern California Edison Company

Email: cathy.karlstad@sce.com

Downloaded December 3, 2007, last updated on November 30, 2007 Commissioner Assigned: Michael R. Peevey on April 17, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Charlotte TerKeurst on September 19, 2006; ALJ Assigned: Jonathan Lakritz on May 9, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Meg Gottstein on April 17, 2006

#### CPUC DOCKET NO. R0604009 CPUC REV 11-30-07

Total number of addressees: 416

JOSEPH M. KARP ATTORNEY WINSTON & STRAWN LLP 101 CALIFORNIA ST

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-5802 FOR: California Cogeneration Council

Email: jkarp@winston.com

Status: PARTY

ADAM J. KATZ
MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

600 13TH ST, NW. WASHINGTON DC 20005

FOR: Morgan Stanley Capital Group, Inc.

Email: ajkatz@mwe.com

Status: PARTY

CURTIS L. KEBLER
J. ARON & COMPANY

SUITE 2600

2121 AVE OF THE STARS LOS ANGELES CA 90067

FOR: J. Aron

Email: curtis.kebler@gs.com

Status: PARTY

CAROLYN M. KEHREIN

**ENERGY MANAGEMENT SERVICES** 

1505 DUNLAP COURT DIXON CA 95620-4208

Email: cmkehrein@ems-ca.com

Status: INFORMATION

STEVEN KELLY

INDEPENDENT ENERGY PRODUCERS

1215 K ST, STE 900 SACRAMENTO CA 95814 Email: steven@iepa.com Status: INFORMATION

KHURSHID KHOJA ASSOCIATE

THELEN REID BROWN RAYSMAN & STEINER

101 SECOND ST, STE 1800 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105 Email: kkhoja@thelenreid.com Status: INFORMATION

THOMAS S. KIMBALL

**MODESTO IRRIGATION DISTRICT** 

1231 11TH ST

MODESTO CA 95354 Email: tomk@mid.org Status: INFORMATION SUE KATELEY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

**CALIFORNIA SOLAR ENERGY INDUSTRIES ASSN** 

PO BOX 782

RIO VISTA CA 94571 Email: info@calseia.org Status: INFORMATION

JAMES W. KEATING BP AMERICA, INC. MAIL CODE 603-1E

150 W. WARRENVILLE RD. NAPERVILLE IL 60563

Email: james.keating@bp.com Status: INFORMATION

RANDALL W. KEEN ATTORNEY
MANATT PHELPS & PHILLIPS, LLP

11355 WEST OLYMPIC BLVD. LOS ANGELES CA 90064 FOR: Los Angeles County Email: rkeen@manatt.com Status: INFORMATION

ALEXIA C. KELLY
THE CLIMATE TRUST

65 SW YAMHILL ST, STE 400 PORTLAND OR 97204

Email: akelly@climatetrust.org Status: INFORMATION

DOUGLAS K. KERNER ATTORNEY **ELLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS, LLP** 

2015 H ST

SACRAMENTO CA 95814 Email: dkk@eslawfirm.com Status: INFORMATION

KIM KIENER

504 CATALINA BLVD. SAN DIEGO CA 92106 Email: kmkiener@fox.net Status: INFORMATION

DANIEL A. KING **SEMPRA ENERGY** 101 ASH ST, HQ 12 SAN DIEGO CA 92101

Email: daking@sempra.com

Downloaded December 3, 2007, last updated on November 30, 2007 Commissioner Assigned: Michael R. Peevey on April 17, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Charlotte TerKeurst on September 19, 2006; ALJ Assigned: Jonathan Lakritz on May 9, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Meg Gottstein on April 17, 2006

# **CPUC DOCKET NO. R0604009 CPUC REV 11-30-07**

Total number of addressees: 416

GREGORY KLATT ATTORNEY DOUGLASS & LIDDELL

411 E. HUNTINGTON DRIVE, STE. 107-356

ARCADIA CA 91006

FOR: Alliance for Retail Energy Markets

Email: klatt@energyattorney.com

Status: PARTY

STEPHEN G. KOERNER, ESQ. **EL PASO CORPORATION** WESTERN PIPELINES

2 NORTH NEVADA AVE COLORADO SPRINGS CO 80903

FOR: El Paso Natural Gas Company/Mojave Pipeline

Company

Email: steve.koerner@elpaso.com

Status: PARTY

AVIS KOWALEWSKI CALPINE CORPORATION 3875 HOPYARD ROAD, STE 345 PLEASANTON CA 94588

Email: kowalewskia@calpine.com

Status: PARTY

CATHERINE M. KRUPKA

MCDERMOTT WILL AND EMERY LLP

600 THIRTEEN STREEET, NW WASHINGTON DC 20005

FOR: Morgan Stanley Capital Group, Inc.

Email: ckrupka@mwe.com

Status: PARTY

STEPHANIE LA SHAWN

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

PO BOX 770000, MAIL CODE B9A SAN FRANCISCO CA 94177 Email: S1L7@pge.com

Status: INFORMATION

Jonathan Lakritz

CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES

505 VAN NESS AVE RM 5020 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: jol@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

JOHN LAUN

APOGEE INTERACTIVE, INC.

1220 ROSECRANS ST., STE 308

SAN DIEGO CA 92106 Email: jlaun@apogee.net Status: INFORMATION JOSEPH R. KLOBERDANZ SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC

PO BOX 1831

SAN DIEGO CA 92112

Email: jkloberdanz@semprautilities.com

Status: INFORMATION

**GREGORY KOISER** 

CONSTELLATION NEW ENERGY, INC.

350 SOUTH GRAND AVE, STE 3800

LOS ANGELES CA 90071

FOR: Constellation New Energy

Email: gregory.koiser@constellation.com

Status: PARTY

STEVE KROMER

3110 COLLEGE AVE, APT 12

BERKELEY CA 94705 FOR: Steve Kromer

Email: stevek@kromer.com

Status: INFORMATION

LARS KVALE

**CENTER FOR RESOURCE SOLUTIONS** 

PRESIDIO BUILDIING 97

PO BOX 39512

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94129

FOR: Center for Resource Solution Email: lars@resource-solutions.org

Status: PARTY

GERALD L. LAHR

ABAG POWER

101 EIGHTH ST OAKLAND CA 94607

FOR: Association of Bay Area Governments

Email: JerryL@abag.ca.gov

Status: INFORMATION

MIKE LAMOND

**ALPINE NATURAL GAS OPERATING CO. #1 LLC** 

PO BOX 550

VALLEY SPRINGS CA 95252

Email: Mike@alpinenaturalgas.com

Status: PARTY

Diana L. Lee

**CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION** 

LEGAL DIVISION

505 VAN NESS AVE RM 4300

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

FOR: DRA

Email: dil@cpuc.ca.gov

Downloaded December 3, 2007, last updated on November 30, 2007 Commissioner Assigned: Michael R. Peevey on April 17, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Charlotte TerKeurst on September 19, 2006; ALJ Assigned: Jonathan Lakritz on May 9, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Meg Gottstein on April 17, 2006

# **CPUC DOCKET NO. R0604009 CPUC REV 11-30-07**

Total number of addressees: 416

VITALY LEE

AES ALAMITOS, LLC 690 N. STUDEBAKER ROAD

LONG BEACH CA 90803 FOR: AES Southland LLC Email: vitaly.lee@aes.com

Status: PARTY

NICHOLAS LENSSEN

ENERGY INSIGHTS

1750 14TH ST, STE 200 BOULDER CO 80302

Email: nlenssen@energy-insights.com

Status: INFORMATION

DONALD C. LIDDELL, P.C. DOUGLASS & LIDDELL

2928 2ND AVE

SAN DIEGO CA 92103

FOR: California Natural Gas Vehicle Association

Email: liddell@energyattorney.com

Status: PARTY

STEVEN G. LINS GENERAL COUNSEL

**GLENDALE WATER AND POWER** 

613 EAST BROADWAY, STE 220 GLENDALE CA 91206-4394 Email: slins@ci.glendale.ca.us

Status: INFORMATION

GRACE LIVINGSTON-NUNLEY ASSISTANT PROJECT

**MANAGER** 

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

PO BOX 770000 MAIL CODE B9A SAN FRANCISCO CA 94177

Email: gxl2@pge.com Status: INFORMATION

JODY S. LONDON

**JODY LONDON CONSULTING** 

PO BOX 3629

OAKLAND CA 94609

Email: jody\_london\_consulting@earthlink.net

Status: INFORMATION

BARRY LOVELL

15708 POMERADO RD., STE 203

POWAY CA 92064 Email: bjl@bry.com Status: INFORMATION BRENDA LEMAY DIRECTOR OF PROJECT

**DEVELOPMENT** 

HORIZON WIND ENERGY

1600 SHATTUCK, STE 222 BERKELEY CA 94709

Email: brenda.lemay@horizonwind.com

Status: INFORMATION

JOHN W. LESLIE ATTORNEY

LUCE, FORWARD, HAMILTON & SCRIPPS, LLP

11988 EL CAMINO REAL, STE 200

SAN DIEGO CA 92130 Email: jleslie@luce.com Status: INFORMATION

KAREN LINDH

**LINDH & ASSOCIATES** 

7909 WALERGA ROAD, NO. 112, PMB 119

ANTELOPE CA 95843 Email: karen@klindh.com Status: INFORMATION

STEVEN A. LIPMAN

STEVEN LIPMAN CONSULTING

500 N. ST 1108

SACRAMENTO CA 95814 FOR: Lipman Consulting

Email: steven@lipmanconsulting.com

Status: INFORMATION

BILL LOCKYER STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL STATE OF CALIFORNIA, DEPT OF JUSTICE

PO BOX 944255

SACRAMENTO CA 94244-2550 Email: ken.alex@doj.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

LAD LORENZ V.P. REGULATORY AFFAIRS

**SEMPRA UTILITIES** 

601 VAN NESS AVE, STE 2060 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102 Email: llorenz@semprautilities.com

Status: PARTY

**BOB LUCAS** 

**LUCAS ADVOCATES** 

1121 L ST, STE 407 SACRAMENTO CA 95814 Email: Bob.lucas@calobby.com

Downloaded December 3, 2007, last updated on November 30, 2007 Commissioner Assigned: Michael R. Peevey on April 17, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Charlotte TerKeurst on September 19, 2006; ALJ Assigned: Jonathan Lakritz on May 9, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Meg Gottstein on April 17, 2006

#### CPUC DOCKET NO. R0604009 CPUC REV 11-30-07

Total number of addressees: 416

ED LUCHA CASE COORDINATOR
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

PO BOX 770000, MAIL CODE B9A SAN FRANCISCO CA 94177

Email: ELL5@pge.com Status: INFORMATION

LYNELLE LUND

COMMERCE ENERGY, INC. 600 ANTON BLVD., STE 2000 COSTA MESA CA 92626 FOR: Commerce Energy, Inc.

Email: Ilund@commerceenergy.com

Status: PARTY

DOUGLAS MACMULLLEN CHIEF, POWER PLANNING

**SECTION** 

CA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

3310 EL CAMINO AVE., RM 356 SACRAMENTO CA 95821 Email: dmacmull@water.ca.gov Status: INFORMATION

AMBER MAHONE

**ENERGY & ENVIRONMENTAL ECONOMICS, INC.** 

101 MONTGOMERY ST, STE 1600 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104 Email: amber@ethree.com Status: INFORMATION

DEREK MARKOLF

**CALIFORNIA CLIMATE ACTION REGISTRY** 

515 S. FLOWER ST, STE 1640 LOS ANGELES CA 90071 Email: dere@climateregistry.org

Status: INFORMATION

CHRIS MARNAY
BERKELEY LAB
1 CYCLOTRON RD MS 90R4000
BERKELEY CA 94720-8136
Email: C\_Marnay@lbl.gov
Status: INFORMATION

MARTIN A. MATTES

NOSSAMAN, GUTHNER, KNOX & ELLIOTT, LLP

50 CALIFORNIA ST,STE 3400 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111 Email: mmattes@nossaman.com

Status: INFORMATION

JANE E. LUCKHARDT ATTORNEY

**DOWNEY BRAND LLP** 

555 CAPITOL MALL, 10TH FLR SACRAMENTO CA 95814

FOR: Sacramento Municipal Utility District Email: jluckhardt@downeybrand.com

Status: PARTY

MARY LYNCH VP - REGULATORY AND LEGISLATIVE

**AFFAIRS** 

**CONSTELLATION ENERGY COMMODITIES GROUP** 

2377 GOLD MEDAL WAY, STE 100

GOLD RIVER CA 95670

Email: mary.lynch@constellation.com

Status: PARTY

ANNE-MARIE MADISON

TRANSALTA ENERGY MARKETING INC.

222 SW COLUMBIA ST, STE 1105

PORTLAND OR 97201

FOR: Market Access & Trade Policy Transalta Energy

Marketing (US) Inc.

Email: Anne-Marie\_Madison@TransAlta.com

Status: INFORMATION

ANNABELLE MALINS CONSUL-SCIENCE AND

**TECHNOLOGY** 

**BRITISH CONSULATE-GENERAL** 

ONE SANSOME ST, STE 850 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104

Email: annabelle.malins@fco.gov.uk

Status: INFORMATION

Jaclyn Marks

**CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION** 

EXECUTIVE DIVISION 505 VAN NESS AVE RM 5306 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: jm3@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

JULIE L. MARTIN WEST ISO COORDINATOR

**NORTH AMERICA GAS AND POWER** 

BP ENERGY COMPANY 501 WESTLAKE PARK BLVD. HOUSTON TX 77079

Email: julie.martin@bp.com Status: INFORMATION

DANIELLE MATTHEWS SEPERAS

CALPINE CORPORATION
1127 11TH ST, STE 242
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
FOR: Calpine Corporation
Email: dseperas@calpine.com

Downloaded December 3, 2007, last updated on November 30, 2007 Commissioner Assigned: Michael R. Peevey on April 17, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Charlotte TerKeurst on September 19, 2006; ALJ Assigned: Jonathan Lakritz on May 9, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Meg Gottstein on April 17, 2006

#### CPUC DOCKET NO. R0604009 CPUC REV 11-30-07

Total number of addressees: 416

MICHAEL MAZUR CHIEF TECHNICAL OFFICER

3 PHASES RENEWABLES, LLC 2100 SEPULVEDA BLVD., STE 37 MANHATTAN BEACH CA 90266 FOR: 3 Phases Energy Services

Email: mmazur@3phasesRenewables.com

Status: PARTY

THOMAS MCCABE

**EDISON MISSION ENERGY** 

18101 VON KARMAN AVE., STE 1700

IRVINE CA 92612 Status: INFORMATION

BARRY F. MCCARTHY ATTORNEY

MCCARTHY & BERLIN, LLP

100 PARK CENTER PLAZA, STE 501

SAN JOSE CA 95113

FOR: Northern California Generation Coalition

Email: bmcc@mccarthylaw.com

Status: PARTY

KEITH R. MCCREA ATTORNEY

SUTHERLAND, ASBILL & BRENNAN, LLP

1275 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON DC 20004-2415

FOR: California Manufacturers & Technology Assn.

Email: keith.mccrea@sablaw.com

Status: PARTY

JEN MCGRAW

CENTER FOR NEIGHBORHOOD TECHNOLOGY

PO BOX 14322

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94114

Email: jen@cnt.org Status: INFORMATION

RACHEL MCMAHON

**CEERT** 

1100 11TH ST, STE 311 SACRAMENTO CA 95814 Email: rachel@ceert.org

Status: INFORMATION

ELENA MELLO

SIERRA PACIFIC POWER COMPANY

6100 NEIL ROAD RENO NV 89520

Email: emello@sppc.com Status: INFORMATION ANDREW MCALLISTER DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONS CALIFORNIA CENTER FOR SUSTAINABLE ENERGY

8690 BALBOA AVE., STE 100 SAN DIEGO CA 92123

Email: andrew.mcallister@energycenter.org

Status: INFORMATION

RICHARD MCCANN, PH.D.

M. CUBED

2655 PORTAGE BAY, STE 3

**DAVIS CA 95616** 

Email: rmccann@umich.edu Status: INFORMATION

Wade McCartney

CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

DIVISION OF STRATEGIC PLANNING

770 L ST, STE 1050 SACRAMENTO CA 95814 Email: wsm@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

MARY MCDONALD DIRECTOR OF STATE AFFAIRS
CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR

**CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR** 151 BLUE RAVINE ROAD

FOLSOM CA 95630 FOR: CAISO

Status: STATE-SERVICE

BRUCE MCLAUGHLIN BRAUN & BLAISING, P.C.

915 L ST, STE 1270 SACRAMENTO CA 95814

FOR: California Municipal Utilities Association

Email: mclaughlin@braunlegal.com

Status: PARTY

BRIAN MCQUOWN RELIANT ENERGY

7251 AMIGO ST., STE 120 LAS VEGAS NV 89119

Email: bmcquown@reliant.com

Status: INFORMATION

DARYL METZ

**CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION** 

1516 9TH ST., MS-20 SACRAMENTO CA 95814

Email: dmetz@energy.state.ca.us

Status: STATE-SERVICE

Downloaded December 3, 2007, last updated on November 30, 2007 Commissioner Assigned: Michael R. Peevey on April 17, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Charlotte TerKeurst on September 19, 2006; ALJ Assigned: Jonathan Lakritz on May 9, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Meg Gottstein on April 17, 2006

#### CPUC DOCKET NO. R0604009 CPUC REV 11-30-07

Total number of addressees: 416

STEVEN S. MICHEL

**WESTERN RESOURCE ADVOCATES** 

2025 SENDA DE ANDRES SANTA FE NM 87501

FOR: Western Resource Advocates Email: smichel@westernresources.org

Status: PARTY

KAREN NORENE MILLS ATTORNEY

**CALIFORNIA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION** 

2300 RIVER PLAZA DRIVE SACRAMENTO CA 95833 Email: kmills@cfbf.com Status: INFORMATION

SAMARA MINDEL REGULATORY AFFAIRS ANALYST

**FELLON-MCCORD & ASSOCIATES** 

9960 CORPORATE CAMPUS DRIVE. STE 2000

LOUISVILLE KY 40223

Email: smindel@knowledgeinenergy.com

Status: INFORMATION

DAVID L. MODISETTE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

**CALIFORNIA ELECTRIC TRANSP. COALITION** 

1015 K ST, STE 200 SACRAMENTO CA 95814 Email: dave@ppallc.com Status: INFORMATION

Rahmon Momoh

**CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION** 

**ELECTRICITY RESOURCES & PRICING BRANCH** 

505 VAN NESS AVE RM 4205 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: rmm@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

ROGER C. MONTGOMERY VICE PRESIDENT, PRICING

**SOUTHWEST GAS CORPORATION** 

PO BOX 98510

LAS VEGAS NV 89193-8510

Email: roger.montgomery@swgas.com

Status: PARTY

RONALD MOORE

**GOLDEN STATE WATER/BEAR VALLEY ELECTRIC** 

630 EAST FOOTHILL BLVD SAN DIMAS CA 91773

FOR: Golden State Water/Bear Valley Electric

Email: rkmoore@gswater.com

Status: PARTY

ROSS A. MILLER ELECTRICITY ANALYSIS OFFICE

**CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION** 

1516 9TH ST MS 20

SACRAMENTO CA 96814-5512

FOR: CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION

Email: rmiller@energy.state.ca.us

Status: STATE-SERVICE

MARCIE MILNER DIRECTOR - REGULATORY AFFAIRS

**SHELL TRADING GAS & POWER COMPANY** 

4445 EASTGATE MALL, STE 100

SAN DIEGO CA 92121

Email: marcie.milner@shell.com

Status: PARTY

CYNTHIA MITCHELL

**ENERGY ECONOMICS, INC.** 

530 COLGATE COURT RENO NV 89503

Email: ckmitchell1@sbcglobal.net

Status: INFORMATION

Ed Moldavsky

**CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION** 

LEGAL DIVISION

505 VAN NESS AVE RM 5037 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: edm@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

WES MONIER STRATEGIC ISSUES AND PLANNING

**MANAGER** 

TURLOCK IRRIGATION DISTRICT

333 EAST CANAL DRIVE, PO BOX 949

TURLOCK CA 95381-0949 Email: fwmonier@tid.org Status: INFORMATION

Beth Moore

**CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION** 

ELECTRICITY RESOURCES & PRICING BRANCH

505 VAN NESS AVE RM 4103 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: blm@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

RICHARD J. MORILLO ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY

CITY OF BURBANK 215 E. OLIVE AVE BURBANK CA 91502

Email: rmorillo@ci.burbank.ca.us

Downloaded December 3, 2007, last updated on November 30, 2007 Commissioner Assigned: Michael R. Peevey on April 17, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Charlotte TerKeurst on September 19, 2006; ALJ Assigned: Jonathan Lakritz on May 9, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Meg Gottstein on April 17, 2006

#### CPUC DOCKET NO. R0604009 CPUC REV 11-30-07

Total number of addressees: 416

GREGG MORRIS DIRECTOR **GREEN POWER INSTITUTE** 2039 SHATTUCK AVE, STE 402 BERKELEY CA 94704

FOR: Green Power Institute Email: gmorris@emf.net

Status: PARTY

STEVEN MOSS

SAN FRANCISCO COMMUNITY POWER COOP

2325 3RD ST, STE 344 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94120 Email: steven@moss.net Status: INFORMATION

Lainie Motamedi

**CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION** DIVISION OF STRATEGIC PLANNING 505 VAN NESS AVE RM 5119 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: Irm@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

**CLYDE MURLEY** 1031 ORDWAY ST ALBANY CA 94706

Email: clyde.murley@comcast.net

Status: INFORMATION

Richard A. Myers

**CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION** 

RATEMAKING BRANCH 505 VAN NESS AVE AREA 4-A SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: ram@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

JESSICA NELSON

PLUMAS-SIERRA RURAL ELECTRIC CO-OP

73233 STATE ROUTE 70, STE A PORTOLA CA 96122-7064

FOR: Plumas-Sierra Rural Electric Coop

Email: notice@psrec.coop

Status: PARTY

SID NEWSOM TARIFF MANAGER

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY** 

GT 14 D6

555 WEST 5TH ST LOS ANGELES CA 90051

Email: snewsom@semprautilities.com

Status: PARTY

Harvey Y. Morris

CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

**LEGAL DIVISION** 

505 VAN NESS AVE RM 5036 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: hym@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

MATTHEW MOST

**EDISON MISSION MARKETING & TRADING, INC.** 

160 FEDERAL ST

BOSTON MA 02110-1776 Status: INFORMATION

PHILLIP J. MULLER

**SCD ENERGY SOLUTIONS** 

436 NOVA ALBION WAY

SAN RAFAEL CA 94903 Email: philm@scdenergy.com

Status: INFORMATION

Scott Murtishaw

**CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION** 

**ENERGY DIVISION** 

505 VAN NESS AVE AREA 4-A SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: sgm@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

SARA STECK MYERS ATTORNEY

122 28TH AVE

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94121

FOR: Center for Energy Efficiency and Renewable

**Technologies** 

Email: ssmvers@att.net

Status: PARTY

DAVID NEMTZOW 1254 9TH ST, NO. 6

SANTA MONICA CA 90401

Email: david@nemtzow.com

Status: INFORMATION

**DESPINA NIEHAUS** 

SAN DIEGO GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

8330 CENTURY PARK COURT, CP32H

SAN DIEGO CA 92123-1530

FOR: San Diego Gas and Electric Company

Email: dniehaus@semprautilities.com

Downloaded December 3, 2007, last updated on November 30, 2007 Commissioner Assigned: Michael R. Peevey on April 17, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Charlotte TerKeurst on September 19, 2006; ALJ Assigned: Jonathan Lakritz on May 9, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Meg Gottstein on April 17, 2006

#### CPUC DOCKET NO. R0604009 CPUC REV 11-30-07

Total number of addressees: 416

SEPHRA A. NINOW POLICY ANALYST

**CALIFORNIA CENTER FOR SUSTAINABLE ENERGY** 

8690 BALBOA AVE, STE 100 SAN DIEGO CA 92123

Email: sephra.ninow@energycenter.org

Status: INFORMATION

**RITA NORTON** 

RITA NORTON AND ASSOCIATES, LLC

18700 BLYTHSWOOD DRIVE, LOS GATOS CA 95030

Email: rita@ritanortonconsulting.com

Status: INFORMATION

**ALVIN PAK** 

SEMPRA GLOBAL ENTERPRISES

101 ASH ST

SAN DIEGO CA 92101

FOR: Sempra Global Enterprises Email: apak@sempraglobal.com

Status: PARTY

LORRAINE PASKETT DIRECTOR, LEGISLATIVE AND

REG. AFFAIRS

LA DEPT. OF WATER & POWER

PO BOX 51111

111 N. HOWARD ST., RM 1536 LOS ANGELES CA 90012

FOR: Los Angeles Dept of Water and Power

Email: Lorraine.Paskett@ladwp.com

Status: PARTY

JOSEPH M. PAUL SENIOR CORPORATE COUNSEL

DYNEGY, INC.

4140 DUBLIN BLVD., STE. 100

DUBLIN CA 94568

Email: Joe.paul@dynegy.com Status: INFORMATION

NORMAN A. PEDERSEN ATTORNEY

HANNA AND MORTON, LLP

444 SOUTH FLOWER ST, NO. 1500

LOS ANGELES CA 90071

FOR: Southern California Generation Coalition/Southern

California Public Power Authority

Email: npedersen@hanmor.com

Status: PARTY

JAN PEPPER

**CLEAN POWER MARKETS, INC.** 

PO BOX 3206 418 BENVENUE AVE LOS ALTOS CA 94024

Email: pepper@cleanpowermarkets.com

Status: INFORMATION

RICK C. NOGER

PRAXAIR PLAINFIELD, INC.

2711 CENTERVILLE ROAD, STE 400

WILMINGTON DE 19808
FOR: Praxair Plainfield, Inc.
Email: rick\_noger@praxair.com

Status: PARTY

TIMOTHY R. ODIL

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1875 LAWRENCE ST, STE 200

DENVER CO 80202

FOR: Center for Energy and Economic Development

Email: todil@mckennalong.com

Status: PARTY

LAURIE PARK

NAVIGANT CONSULTING, INC.

3100 ZINFANDEL DRIVE, STE 600 RANCHO CORDOVA CA 95670-6078 Email: lpark@navigantconsulting.com

Status: INFORMATION

SHERIDAN J. PAUKER

WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI

SPEAR TOWER, SUITE 3300

ONE MARKET ST

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105 Email: spauker@wsgr.com Status: INFORMATION

CARL PECHMAN
POWER ECONOMICS

901 CENTER ST

SANTA CRUZ CA 95060

Email: cpechman@powereconomics.com

Status: INFORMATION

ROGER PELOTE

**WILLIAMS POWER COMPANY** 

12736 CALIFA ST

VALLEY VILLAGE CA 91607 Email: roger.pelote@williams.com

Status: INFORMATION

Joel T. Perlstein

**CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION** 

**LEGAL DIVISION** 

505 VAN NESS AVE RM 5133 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: jtp@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

Downloaded December 3, 2007, last updated on November 30, 2007 Commissioner Assigned: Michael R. Peevey on April 17, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Charlotte TerKeurst on September 19, 2006; ALJ Assigned: Jonathan Lakritz on May 9, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Meg Gottstein on April 17, 2006

#### CPUC DOCKET NO. R0604009 CPUC REV 11-30-07

Total number of addressees: 416

CARLA PETERMAN

UCEI

2547 CHANNING WAY BERKELEY CA 94720

Email: carla.peterman@gmail.com

Status: INFORMATION

ROBERT L. PETTINATO

LOS ANGELES DEPARTMENT OF WATER & POWER

111 NORTH HOPE ST, STE 1151 LOS ANGELES CA 90012 Email: robert.pettinato@ladwp.com

Status: INFORMATION

Paul S. Phillips

**CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION** 

ELECTRICITY RESOURCES & PRICING BRANCH 505 VAN NESS AVE RM 4101 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: psp@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

EDWARD G POOLE

**ANDERSON DONOVAN & POOLE** 

601 CALIFORNIA ST STE 1300 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94108

FOR: San Francisco Community Power

Email: epoole@adplaw.com

Status: PARTY

**BRIAN POTTS** 

**FOLEY & LARDNER** 

PO BOX 1497

150 EAST GILMAN ST MADISON WI 53701-1497 Email: bpotts@foley.com Status: INFORMATION

VIDHYA PRABHAKARAN

GOODIN, MACBRIDE, SQUERI, DAY, LAMPREY

505 SANSOME ST, STE 900 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111

FOR: Independent Energy Producers Association Email: vprabhakaran@goodinmacbride.com

Status: PARTY

JJ PRUCNAL

**SOUTHWEST GAS CORPORATION** 

PO BOX 98510

LAS VEGAS NV 89193-8510 Email: jj.prucnal@swgas.com Status: INFORMATION COLIN PETHERAM DIRECTOR-REGULATORY

**SBC CALIFORNIA** 

140 NEW MONTGOMERY ST., STE 1325

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105
Email: colin.petheram@att.com
Status: INFORMATION

PHILIP D. PETTINGILL

CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR

151 BLUE RAVINE ROAD FOLSOM CA 95630 FOR: CAISO

Email: ppettingill@caiso.com Status: STATE-SERVICE

GORDON PICKERING PRINCIPAL

NAVIGANT CONSULTING, INC. 3100 ZINFANDEL DRIVE, STE 600 RANCHO CORDOVA CA 95670-6078

Email: gpickering@navigantconsulting.com

Status: INFORMATION

JENNIFER PORTER POLICY ANALYST

**CALIFORNIA CENTER FOR SUSTAINABLE ENERGY** 

8690 BALBOA AVE, STE 100 SAN DIEGO CA 92123

Email: jennifer.porter@energycenter.org

Status: INFORMATION

**EVAN POWERS** 

CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD

1001 I ST, PO BOX 2815 SACRAMENTO CA 95812 Email: epowers@arb.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

RASHA PRINCE

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY** 

555 WEST 5TH ST, GT14D6 LOS ANGELES CA 90013

Email: rprince@semprautilities.com

Status: INFORMATION

MARC PRYOR

**CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION** 

1516 9TH ST., MS-20 SACRAMENTO CA 95814

Email: mpryor@energy.state.ca.us

Status: STATE-SERVICE

Downloaded December 3, 2007, last updated on November 30, 2007 Commissioner Assigned: Michael R. Peevey on April 17, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Charlotte TerKeurst on September 19, 2006; ALJ Assigned: Jonathan Lakritz on May 9, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Meg Gottstein on April 17, 2006

# **CPUC DOCKET NO. R0604009 CPUC REV 11-30-07**

Total number of addressees: 416

BALWANT S. PUREWAL

**DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES** 

3310 EL CAMINO AVE., LL-90 SACRAMENTO CA 95821 Email: bpurewal@water.ca.gov

Status: INFORMATION

STEVE RAHON DIRECTOR, TARIFF & REGULATORY

**ACCOUNTS** 

**SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY** 

8330 CENTURY PARK COURT, CP32C

SAN DIEGO CA 92123-1548

FOR: San Diego Gas & Electric Company Email: lschavrien@semprautilities.com

Status: PARTY

TIFFANY RAU POLICY AND COMMUNICATIONS

**MANAGER** 

**CARSON HYDROGEN POWER PROJECT LLC** 

ONE WORLD TRADE CENTER, STE 1600

LONG BEACH CA 90831-1600

FOR: Carson Hydrogen Power Project LLC

Email: tiffany.rau@bp.com

Status: PARTY

ROBERT J. REINHARD

**MORRISON AND FOERSTER** 

425 MARKET ST

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105-2482 Email: rreinhard@mofo.com Status: INFORMATION

JANILL RICHARDS DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL CALIFORNIA ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE

1515 CLAY ST, 20TH FLR OAKLAND CA 94702

FOR: People of the State of California Email: janill.richards@doj.ca.gov

Status: PARTY

Steve Roscow

**CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION** 

RATEMAKING BRANCH 505 VAN NESS AVE AREA 4-A SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: scr@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

JAMES ROSS RCS. INC.

500 CHESTERFIELD CENTER, STE 320

CHESTERFIELD MO 63017 Email: jimross@r-c-s-inc.com Status: INFORMATION BARRY RABE 1427 ROSS ST

PLYMOUTH MI 48170 Email: brabe@umich.edu Status: INFORMATION

Kristin Ralff Douglas

**CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION** 

DIVISION OF STRATEGIC PLANNING 505 VAN NESS AVE RM 5119 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: krd@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

JOHN R. REDDING

**ARCTURUS ENERGY CONSULTING** 

44810 ROSEWOOD TERRACE MENDOCINO CA 95460

Email: johnrredding@earthlink.net

Status: INFORMATION

DAVID REYNOLDS MEMBER SERVICES MANAGER

**NORTHERN CALIFORNIA POWER AGENCY** 

180 CIRBY WAY

ROSEVILLE CA 95678-6420 Email: davidreynolds@ncpa.com

Status: INFORMATION

THEODORE ROBERTS ATTORNEY

**SEMPRA GLOBAL** 

101 ASH ST, HQ 13D SAN DIEGO CA 92101-3017

FOR: Sempra Global/Sempra Energy Solutions

Email: troberts@sempra.com

Status: PARTY

GRANT ROSENBLUM, ESQ.

**CALIFORNIA ISO** 

LEGAL AND REGULATORY DEPARTMENT

151 BLUE RAVINE ROAD FOLSOM CA 95630

Email: grosenblum@caiso.com

Status: INFORMATION

ROBERT K. ROZANSKI

LOS ANGELES DEPT OF WATER AND POWER

111 NORTH HOPE ST, RM 1520 LOS ANGELES CA 90012

Email: Robert.Rozanski@ladwp.com

Downloaded December 3, 2007, last updated on November 30, 2007 Commissioner Assigned: Michael R. Peevey on April 17, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Charlotte TerKeurst on September 19, 2006; ALJ Assigned: Jonathan Lakritz on May 9, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Meg Gottstein on April 17, 2006

# **CPUC DOCKET NO. R0604009 CPUC REV 11-30-07**

Total number of addressees: 416

Nancy Ryan

**CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION** 

EXECUTIVE DIVISION 505 VAN NESS AVE RM 5217 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: ner@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

RANDY SABLE

**SOUTHWEST GAS CORPORATION** 

MAILSTOP: LVB-105

5241 SPRING MOUNTAIN ROAD

LAS VEGAS NV 89193

Email: randy.sable@swgas.com

Status: INFORMATION

Jason R. Salmi Klotz

**CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION** 

ENERGY RESOURCES BRANCH 505 VAN NESS AVE AREA 4-A SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: jk1@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

SOUMYA SASTRY

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

MAIL CODE B9A PO BOX 770000

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94177 Email: svs6@pge.com Status: INFORMATION

MICHAEL SCHEIBLE DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER

**CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD** 

1001 I ST

SACRAMENTO CA 95677

FOR: California Air Resources Board

Email: mscheibl@arb.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

STEVEN SCHILLER

SCHILLER CONSULTING, INC.

111 HILLSIDE AVE
PIEDMONT CA 94611
Email: steve@schiller.com
Status: INFORMATION

REED V. SCHMIDT VICE PRESIDENT

**BARTLE WELLS ASSOCIATES** 

1889 ALCATRAZ AVE BERKELEY CA 94703

FOR: California City-County Street Light Association

Email: rschmidt@bartlewells.com

Status: INFORMATION

Pearlie Sabino

**CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION** 

**ENERGY COST OF SERVICE & NATURAL GAS BRANCH** 

505 VAN NESS AVE RM 4209 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: pzs@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

SAM SADLER

**OREGON DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY** 

625 NE MARION ST SALEM OR 97301-3737

Email: samuel.r.sadler@state.or.us

Status: INFORMATION

JUDITH B. SANDERS ATTORNEY

**CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR** 

151 BLUE RAVINE ROAD FOLSOM CA 95630 FOR: CAISO

Email: jsanders@caiso.com Status: STATE-SERVICE

JANINE L. SCANCARELLI ATTORNEY

FOLGER, LEVIN & KAHN, LLP 275 BATTERY ST, 23RD FLR SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111 Email: jscancarelli@flk.com

Status: INFORMATION

JENINE SCHENK

**APS ENERGY SERVICES** 

400 E. VAN BUREN ST, STE 750

PHOENIX AZ 85004

FOR: APS Energy Services Company Email: jenine.schenk@apses.com

Status: PARTY

STEVEN S. SCHLEIMER DIRECTOR, COMPLIANCE &

REGULATORY AFFAIRS BARCLAYS BANK, PLC 200 PARK AVE, FIFTH FLR NEW YORK NY 10166 FOR: Barclays Capital

Email: steven.schleimer@barclayscapital.com

Status: PARTY

DONALD SCHOENBECK

RCS, INC.

900 WASHINGTON ST, STE 780 VANCOUVER WA 98660 Email: dws@r-c-s-inc.com

Downloaded December 3, 2007, last updated on November 30, 2007 Commissioner Assigned: Michael R. Peevey on April 17, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Charlotte TerKeurst on September 19, 2006; ALJ Assigned: Jonathan Lakritz on May 9, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Meg Gottstein on April 17, 2006

#### CPUC DOCKET NO. R0604009 CPUC REV 11-30-07

Total number of addressees: 416

BILL SCHRAND

SOUTHWEST GAS CORPORATON

PO BOX 98510

LAS VEGAS NV 89193-8510 Email: bill.schrand@swgas.com Status: INFORMATION

Don Schultz

**CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION** 

ELECTRICITY RESOURCES & PRICING BRANCH

770 L ST, STE 1050 SACRAMENTO CA 95814 Email: dks@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

MONICA A. SCHWEBS, ESQ. BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN LLP

PO BOX V

1333 N. CALIFORNIA BLVD., STE 210

WALNUT CREEK CA 94596

Email: monica.schwebs@bingham.com

Status: INFORMATION

BETTY SETO POLICY ANALYST

KEMA, INC.

492 NINTH ST, STE 220 OAKLAND CA 94607

Email: Betty.Seto@kema.com Status: INFORMATION

**KYLE SILON** 

**ECOSECURITIES CONSULTING LIMITED** 

529 SE GRAND AVE PORTLAND OR 97214

Email: kyle.silon@ecosecurities.com

Status: INFORMATION

Sean A. Simon

**CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION** 

ENERGY RESOURCES BRANCH 505 VAN NESS AVE AREA 4-A SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: svn@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

DAN SKOPEC

**CLIMATE & ENERGY CONSULTING** 

1201 K ST STE 970 SACRAMENTO CA 95814

FOR: Climate & Energy Consulting Email: danskopec@gmail.com Status: INFORMATION

CYNTHIA SCHULTZ REGULATORY FILING

COORDINATOR

PACIFIC POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY

825 NE MULTNOMAH PORTLAND OR 97232

Email: cynthia.schultz@pacificorp.com

Status: PARTY

LISA SCHWARTZ SENIOR ANALYST

ORGEON PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

PO BOX 2148

SALEM OR 97308-2148

Email: lisa.c.schwartz@state.or.us

Status: INFORMATION

PAUL M. SEBY

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1875 LAWRENCE ST, STE 200

DENVER CO 80202

FOR: Center for Energy and Economic Development

Email: pseby@mckennalong.com

Status: PARTY

NORA SHERIFF ATTORNEY

ALCANTAR & KAHL, LLP

120 MONTGOMERY ST, STE 2200 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104

Email: nes@a-klaw.com Status: INFORMATION

DAN SILVERIA

SURPRISE VALLEY ELECTRIC CORPORATION

PO BOX 691

ALTURAS CA 96101

FOR: Surprise Valley Electric Cooperative

Email: dansvec@hdo.net

Status: PARTY

KEVIN J. SIMONSEN

**ENERGY MANAGEMENT SERVICES** 

646 EAST THIRD AVE DURANGO CO 81301

Email: kjsimonsen@ems-ca.com

Status: INFORMATION

DEBORAH SLON DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL,

**ENVIRONMENT** 

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

1300 I ST, 15TH FLR SACRAMENTO CA 95814 Email: deborah.slon@doj.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

Downloaded December 3, 2007, last updated on November 30, 2007 Commissioner Assigned: Michael R. Peevey on April 17, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Charlotte TerKeurst on September 19, 2006; ALJ Assigned: Jonathan Lakritz on May 9, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Meg Gottstein on April 17, 2006

#### CPUC DOCKET NO. R0604009 CPUC REV 11-30-07

Total number of addressees: 416

AIMEE M. SMITH ATTORNEY

SEMPRA ENERGY 101 ASH ST HQ13 SAN DIEGO CA 92101

FOR: San Diego Gas & Electric Company and Southern

California Gas Company

Email: amsmith@sempra.com

Status: PARTY

GLORIA D. SMITH

ADAMS, BROADWELL, JOSEPH & CARDOZO

601 GATEWAY BLVD., STE 1000 SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO CA 94080 Email: gsmith@adamsbroadwell.com

Status: INFORMATION

RICHARD SMITH

MODESTO IRRIGATION DISTRICT

1231 11TH ST

MODESTO CA 95352-4060 Email: richards@mid.org Status: INFORMATION

JEANNE M. SOLE DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, RM. 234

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102

FOR: City and County of San Francisco

Email: jeanne.sole@sfgov.org

Status: PARTY

JAMES D. SQUERI ATTORNEY

**GOODIN MACBRIDE SQUERI RITCHIE & DAY LLP** 

505 SANSOME ST, STE 900 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111 FOR: Powerex Corp.

Email: jsqueri@gmssr.com

Status: PARTY

ANNIE STANGE
ALCANTAR & KAHL

1300 SW FIFTH AVE., STE 1750

PORTLAND OR 97201 Email: sas@a-klaw.com Status: INFORMATION

Henry Stern

CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES 505 VAN NESS AVE RM 2106

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: hs1@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE Donald R. Smith

**CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION** 

**ELECTRICITY RESOURCES & PRICING BRANCH** 

505 VAN NESS AVE RM 4209 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: dsh@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

KELLIE SMITH

**SENATE ENERGY/UTILITIES & COMMUNICATION** 

STATE CAPITOL, RM 4038 SACRAMENTO CA 95814 Email: kellie.smith@sen.ca.gov Status: INFORMATION

ROBIN SMUTNY-JONES

**CALIFORNIA ISO** 

151 BLUE RAVINE ROAD FOLSOM CA 95630

Email: rsmutny-jones@caiso.com

Status: INFORMATION

DARRELL SOYARS MANAGER-RESOURCE

PERMITTING&STRATEGIC SIERRA PACIFIC RESOURCES

6100 NEIL ROAD RENO NV 89520-0024

FOR: Sierra Pacific Resources Email: dsoyars@sppc.com Status: INFORMATION

SEEMA SRINIVASAN ATTORNEY

**ALCANTAR & KAHL, LLP** 

120 MONTGOMERY ST, STE 2200 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104

FOR: Energy Producers & Users Coalition

Email: sls@a-klaw.com

Status: PARTY

FRANK STERN

**SUMMIT BLUE CONSULTING** 

1722 14TH ST, STE 230 BOULDER CO 80302

FOR: Summit Blue Consulting Email: fstern@summitblue.com Status: INFORMATION

F. Jackson Stoddard

**CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION** 

EXECUTIVE DIVISION 505 VAN NESS AVE RM 5125 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: fjs@cpuc.ca.gov

Downloaded December 3, 2007, last updated on November 30, 2007 Commissioner Assigned: Michael R. Peevey on April 17, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Charlotte TerKeurst on September 19, 2006; ALJ Assigned: Jonathan Lakritz on May 9, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Meg Gottstein on April 17, 2006

#### CPUC DOCKET NO. R0604009 CPUC REV 11-30-07

Total number of addressees: 416

PATRICK STONER PROGRAM DIRECTOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION

1303 J ST, STE 250 SACRAMENTO CA 95814 Email: pstoner@lgc.org Status: INFORMATION

KENNY SWAIN

**NAVIGANT CONSULTING** 

3100 ZINFANDEL DRIVE, STE 600 RANCHO CORDOVA CA 95670

Email: kenneth.swain@navigantconsulting.com

Status: INFORMATION

Christine S. Tam

**CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION** 

ELECTRICITY RESOURCES & PRICING BRANCH 505 VAN NESS AVE RM 4209 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: tam@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

WEBSTER TASAT

**AIR RESOURCES BOARD** 

1001 I ST

SACRAMENTO CA 95814 Email: wtasat@arb.ca.gov Status: INFORMATION

Charlotte TerKeurst

**CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION** 

DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES 505 VAN NESS AVE RM 5117

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214 Email: cft@cpuc.ca.gov

Status: STATE-SERVICE

PATRICIA THOMPSON

**SUMMIT BLUE CONSULTING** 2920 CAMINO DIABLO, STE 210

WALNUT CREEK CA 94597

Email: pthompson@summitblue.com

Status: INFORMATION

EDWARD J. TIEDEMANN ATTORNEY

KRONICK, MOSKOVITZ, TIEDEMANN & GIRARD

400 CAPITOL MALL, 27TH FLR SACRAMENTO CA 95814-4416

FOR: Placer County Water Agency & Kings River

Conservation District Email: etiedemann@kmtq.com

Status: INFORMATION

NINA SUETAKE ATTORNEY

THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK

711 VAN NESS AVE., STE. 350 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102 Email: nsuetake@turn.org

Status: PARTY

Jeorge S. Tagnipes

**CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION** 

ENERGY RESOURCES BRANCH 505 VAN NESS AVE AREA 4-A SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: jst@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

JAMES W. TARNAGHAN

**DUANE MORRIS LLP** 

**SUITE 2000** 

ONE MARKET, SPEAR TOWER SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105

FOR: Lodi Gas Storage

Email: jwmctarnaghan@duanemorris.com

Status: INFORMATION

ROBERT R. TAYLOR

AGRICULTURAL IMPROVEMENT AND POWER DIST.

1600 NORTH PRIEST DRIVE, PAB221

TEMPE AZ 85281

Email: rrtaylor@srpnet.com

Status: PARTY

KAREN TERRANOVA

ALCANTAR & KAHL, LLP

120 MONTGOMERY ST, STE 2200 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104 Email: filings@a-klaw.com Status: INFORMATION

DEAN R. TIBBS PRESIDENT

ADVANCED ENERGY STRATEGIES, INC.

1390 WILLOW PASS ROAD, STE 610

CONCORD CA 94520 Email: dtibbs@aes4u.com Status: INFORMATION

SCOTT TOMASHEFSKY

**NORTHERN CALIFORNIA POWER AGENCY** 

180 CIRBY WAY

ROSEVILLE CA 95678-6420

Email: scott.tomashefsky@ncpa.com

Downloaded December 3, 2007, last updated on November 30, 2007 Commissioner Assigned: Michael R. Peevey on April 17, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Charlotte TerKeurst on September 19, 2006; ALJ Assigned: Jonathan Lakritz on May 9, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Meg Gottstein on April 17, 2006

# CPUC DOCKET NO. R0604009 CPUC REV 11-30-07

Total number of addressees: 416

WAYNE TOMLINSON **EL PASO CORPORATION** WESTERN PIPELINES

2 NORTH NEVADA AVE

COLORADO SPRINGS CO 80903 Email: william.tomlinson@elpaso.com

Status: INFORMATION

ALLEN K. TRIAL

**SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY** 

HQ-13 101 ASH ST

SAN DIEGO CA 92101 Email: atrial@sempra.com

Status: PARTY

ANDREW J. VAN HORN **VAN HORN CONSULTING** 

12 LIND COURT ORINDA CA 94563

Email: andy.vanhorn@vhcenergy.com

Status: INFORMATION

**BETH VAUGHAN** 

**CALIFORNIA COGENERATION COUNCIL** 

4391 N. MARSH ELDER COURT CONCORD CA 94521

Email: beth@beth411.com

Status: PARTY

SYMONE VONGDEUANE **SEMPRA ENERGY SOLUTIONS** 

101 ASH ST. HQ09

SAN DIEGO CA 92101-3017 FOR: Sempra Energy Solutions

Email: svongdeuane@semprasolutions.com

Status: PARTY

**DEVRA WANG** 

NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL

111 SUTTER ST, 20TH FLR SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104 Email: dwang@nrdc.org

Status: INFORMATION

JOY A. WARREN REGULATORY ADMINISTRATOR

**MODESTO IRRIGATION DISTRICT** 

1231 11TH ST

MODESTO CA 95354 Email: joyw@mid.org Status: PARTY

Lana Tran

**CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION** 

ELECTRIC GENERATION PERFORMANCE BRANCH

505 VAN NESS AVE AREA 2-D SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: Itt@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

ANN L. TROWBRIDGE ATTORNEY **DAY CARTER & MURPHY. LLP** 

3620 AMERICAN RIVER DRIVE, STE 205

SACRAMENTO CA 95864

FOR: California Clean DG Coalition/Northwest Natural Gas

Email: atrowbridge@daycartermurphy.com

Status: PARTY

ROGER VAN HOY

MODESTO IRRIGATION DISTRICT

1231 11TH ST

MODESTO CA 95354 Email: rogerv@mid.org Status: INFORMATION

**EDWARD VINE** 

LAWRENCE BERKELEY NATIONAL LABORATORY

**BUILDING 90R4000** BERKELEY CA 94720 Email: elvine@lbl.gov Status: INFORMATION

BARRY R. WALLERSTEIN EXECUTIVE OFFICER

SOUTH COAST AQMD 21865 COPLEY DRIVE

**DIAMOND BAR CA 91765-4182** 

FOR: South Coast Air Quality Management District

Email: bwallerstein@agmd.gov

Status: PARTY

CHRISTOPHER J. WARNER

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

77 BEALE ST, PO BOX 7442 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94120-7442 FOR: Pacific Gas and Electric

Email: cjw5@pge.com

Status: PARTY

MICHAEL WAUGH

AIR RESOURCES BOARD

1001 10TH ST

SACRAMENTO CA 95814 Email: mwaugh@arb.ca.gov Status: INFORMATION

Downloaded December 3, 2007, last updated on November 30, 2007 Commissioner Assigned: Michael R. Peevey on April 17, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Charlotte TerKeurst on September 19, 2006; ALJ Assigned: Jonathan Lakritz on May 9, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Meg Gottstein on April 17, 2006

#### CPUC DOCKET NO. R0604009 CPUC REV 11-30-07

Total number of addressees: 416

LISA WEINZIMER ASSOCIATE EDITOR

**PLATTS MCGRAW-HILL** 695 NINTH AVE, NO. 2 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94118

Email: lisa weinzimer@platts.com

Status: INFORMATION

JOHN B. WELDON, JR.

SALMON, LEWIS & WELDON, P.L.C. 2850 EAST CAMELBACK ROAD, STE 200

PHOENIX AZ 85016

FOR: Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement and

Power District Email: jbw@slwplc.com

Status: PARTY

Pamela Wellner

**CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION** 

**ENERGY RESOURCES BRANCH** 505 VAN NESS AVE AREA 4-A SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-3214

Email: pw1@cpuc.ca.gov Status: STATE-SERVICE

WILLIAM W. WESTERFIELD, 111 ATTORNEY

**ELLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS L.L.P.** 

2015 H ST

SACRAMENTO CA 95814

FOR: Sierra Pacific Power Company

Email: www@eslawfirm.com

Status: PARTY

GREGGORY L. WHEATLAND ATTORNEY **ELLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS, LLP** 

2015 H ST

SACRAMENTO CA 95814 FOR: LS Power, Inc. Email: glw@eslawfirm.com

Status: PARTY

KATHRYN WIG PARALEGAL

NRG ENERGY, INC. 211 CARNEGIE CENTER PRINCETON NY 8540

Email: Kathryn.Wig@nrgenergy.com

Status: INFORMATION

REID A. WINTHROP

PILOT POWER GROUP, INC.

8910 UNIVERSITY CENTER LANE, STE 520

SAN DIEGO CA 92122

Email: rwinthrop@pilotpowergroup.com

Status: PARTY

VIRGIL WELCH STAFF ATTORNEY **ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE** 

1107 9TH ST, STE 540 SACRAMENTO CA 95814

Email: vwelch@environmentaldefense.org

Status: PARTY

ANDREA WELLER STRATEGIC ENERGY

3130 D BALFOUR RD., STE 290 BRENTWOOD CA 94513

FOR: Strategic Energy Email: aweller@sel.com

Status: PARTY

**ELIZABETH WESTBY ALCANTAR & KAHL, LLP** 

1300 SW FIFTH AVE. STE 1750

PORTLAND OR 97201 Email: eqw@a-klaw.com Status: INFORMATION

S. NANCY WHANG ATTORNEY

MANATT, PHELPS & PHILLIPS, LLP

11355 WEST OLYMPIC BLVD. LOS ANGELES CA 90064 Email: nwhang@manatt.com Status: INFORMATION

JOSEPH F. WIEDMAN ATTORNEY

**GOODIN MACBRIDE SQUERI DAY & LAMPREY LLP** 

505 SANSOME ST. STE 900 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111

Email: jwiedman@goodinmacbride.com

Status: INFORMATION

VALERIE J. WINN

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

PO BOX 770000, B9A

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94177-0001

Email: vjw3@pge.com Status: INFORMATION

**RYAN WISER BERKELEY LAB** 

MS-90-4000

ONE CYCLOTRON ROAD BERKELEY CA 94720

Email: rhwiser@lbl.gov Status: INFORMATION

Downloaded December 3, 2007, last updated on November 30, 2007 Commissioner Assigned: Michael R. Peevey on April 17, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Charlotte TerKeurst on September 19, 2006; ALJ Assigned: Jonathan Lakritz on May 9, 2006

ALJ Assigned: Meg Gottstein on April 17, 2006

#### CPUC DOCKET NO. R0604009 CPUC REV 11-30-07

Total number of addressees: 416

ELLEN WOLFE
RESERO CONS

RESERO CONSULTING
9289 SHADOW BROOK PL.
GRANITE BAY CA 95746
Email: ewolfe@resero.com
Status: INFORMATION

**KEVIN WOODRUFF** 

**WOODRUFF EXPERT SERVICES** 

1100 K ST, STE 204 SACRAMENTO CA 95814

Email: kdw@woodruff-expert-services.com

Status: INFORMATION

E.J. WRIGHT

OCCIDENTAL POWER SERVICES, INC.

5 GREENWAY PLAZA, STE 110 HOUSTON TX 77046

Email: ej\_wright@oxy.com

Status: PARTY

**HUGH YAO** 

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY** 

555 W. 5TH ST, GT22G2 LOS ANGELES CA 90013

Email: HYao@SempraUtilities.com

Status: INFORMATION

ELIZABETH ZELLJADT 1725 I ST, NW STE 300 WASHINGTON DC 20006 Email: ez@pointcarbon.com Status: INFORMATION DON WOOD

**PACIFIC ENERGY POLICY CENTER** 

4539 LEE AVE LA MESA CA 91941 Email: dwood8@cox.net

Status: PARTY

CATHY S. WOOLLUMS

MIDAMERICAN ENERGY HOLDINGS COMPANY

106 EAST SECOND ST DAVENPORT IA 52801

FOR: Kern River Gas Transmission Email: cswoollums@midamerican.com

Status: PARTY

JUSTIN C. WYNNE

**BRAU & BLAISING, P.C.** 

915 L ST, STE 1270 SACRAMENTO CA 95814

Email: wynne@braunlegal.com

Status: INFORMATION

JEANNE ZAIONTZ

**BP ENERGY COMPANY** 

501 WESTLAKE PARK BLVD, RM. 4328

HOUSTON TX 77079 Email: zaiontj@bp.com Status: INFORMATION

DAVID ZONANA DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL CALIFORNIA ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE

455 GOLDEN GATE AVE, STE 11000

SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102
Email: david.zonana@doj.ca.gov
Status: STATE-SERVICE